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Abstract

This thesis is designed to reconsider art therapy through the lens of a well educated and newly experienced art educator. It follows the relationship between art education and art therapy as they evolve, following largely separate paths over time, to develop a conversation that will begin to examine how art therapy has been applied to art education in the past, and to offer possible suggestions for further research in several overlapping points of study. I use a critical pedagogy framework and a generic qualitative research methodology as I conduct my research to develop ideas and raise questions that I feel have the potential to improve my pedagogical strategies and to open up a new set of possibilities for other art educators as to how art therapy might be reconsidered. The main research question that this inquiry explores is how can art therapy inform an art education curriculum?

This study includes a historical inquiry, emphasizing events, theories, and some of the key figures who have made significant contributions to both art education and art therapy, and a review of recent accounts in which art therapy and art education have been used in conjunction. My own experience and practice is another focus of this study, and I relate trends in literature back to my own ideologies and approach to pedagogy.

The purpose of this study is by no means to offer advice to art educators on how they can function as art therapists. This study does not suggest that art educators can or should expect to function in the same ways as an art therapist might, and it does not
encourage art educators to try to diagnose developmental problems or disabilities in their students because of the information that can be garnered from art therapy. It is my goal in writing this to simply begin a preliminary conversation that can perhaps offer ideas to art educators on how to think about improving their practice, and ideas for me on how I might improve my own, from ideas that are rooted in the tradition of art therapy.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Simply placing the two terms art therapy and art education in the same sentence as I do now can be enough to at least raise inquisitive eyebrows, if not to create a huge red flag for professionals working in either discipline. This is a particularly interesting idea to me in that there are a lot of similarities between the two, as they are both rooted in art; a cord that strongly connects them to each other. However, the differences between the two are so great, that a line has been drawn in the sand and they have evolved largely separated from one another. In conducting this qualitative research study, I wish to critically explore the possibilities for connections between art therapy and art education, to consider what has come before to lead art education and art therapy to where they are and to how they define themselves today, and to open a conversation between the two, to consider how they might come together in the future, and what implications this merger might have for practice.

For the purposes of this study, I concentrate on how art therapy might inform art education, but it is certainly interesting and valid to consider ways in which art education could inform and complicate aspects of art therapy as well. I have purposefully considered my research in these terms, as I do not feel that I am experienced enough with art therapy to speak in any voice of authority in that respect.

In writing this paper, I provide a historical context for both art education and art therapy. For this study, I limited my research to visual art education, and I looked at perspectives of art education and art therapy from resources whose primary focus lies
within the United States. My purpose in including this information is not to provide a comprehensive history of either art education or art therapy, but instead to provide a context from which to consider the (lack of) communication and interaction between art education and art therapy, and to have a foundation on which to provide a broader perspective on how and why these interactions have been and might be motivated to or deterred from taking place.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Before going any further, I would like to define art education and art therapy as they are used in this context. Neither definition is absolute, nor do these definitions represent the only accurate explanation for either term. The best description that I found that successfully sums up the complexities involved in defining art education came from Foster Wygant's introduction to a book that the National Art Education Association published, *Framing the Past*. Wygant (in Soucy, 1990) stated,

> We must first see art education as a complex of interactions, a process of patterns and misfits, beginnings, blendings, transformations, and declines—a nebulous form, ever-changing, with no precise outline. Within the complex we must include all art activity in the school, of course, but in the library and museum as well, and in evening classes and community agencies for the elderly and the ill—all, perhaps, except the activity of the professional artist as artist. (pg. x)

Art education does have some element of therapy, which as Rubin (1999) explained it occurs as art educators often provide art experiences that prove to be growth-
enhancing, and nurture student's feelings of competence. Rubin (1999) also noted how art therapy contains elements of art education, as it is based in helping others to create. The two differ greatly however, in their primary intentions; education is the goal in art education and therapy in art therapy. Malchiodi (1998) provided a working definition that describes art therapy as it applies in this body of research, “It is a modality that can help individuals of all ages to create meaning and achieve insight, find relief from overwhelming emotions or trauma, resolve conflicts and problems, enrich daily life, and achieve an increased sense of well-being” (pg. 1). Some of the capstones of art therapy are the belief that all individuals have the capacity to express themselves creatively, and that the product is less important and less valuable than the therapeutic process involved in creating it. Within a public school setting, art therapy is generally conducted (in rare instances where schools have the resources to provide it) in one-on-one sessions, where art therapists work directly with students who have learning, behavioral, emotional, and/or physical disabilities (Jarboe, 2002), but art therapy is by no means limited to this application.

It is important to note that art therapists have very specific graduate-level training that is quite different in nature from that of an art educator. The most basic certification, ATR, is granted following specific graduate level courses and completion of 1000 hours of supervised post-graduate clinical experience. An independent organization called the Art Therapy Certification Board has been recognized by the American Art Therapy Association as the authority for credentialing art therapists. The next level is ATR-BC, which means that the art therapist is board certified, which is accomplished by passing a
national examination and requires re-certification every five years that may be granted with a successful completion of at least 100 continuing education credits that have been earned in that five year period. Interestingly enough, there is only one school in Ohio that has a graduate level art therapy program, a small school with primarily female enrollment called Ursuline. A graduate level art education program, however, is a fairly common provision among the larger universities here in Ohio. The American Art Therapy Association listed programs on their website that they have approved and this list is limited to thirty-two graduate-level programs nationwide.

In this inquiry, I also refer to inclusion. Inclusion is the practice of providing every student with accommodations that allow them to successfully function in every class alongside their peers, regardless of their ability level. In a special education classroom, on the other hand, students are removed from their home classroom to receive more specific and individualized instruction. The degree of inclusion or exclusion is determined by a number of factors, and is often bounded by a students IEP, or individualized education plan, that their teacher and school psychologist develop for each student's specific needs.

Before elaborating any further, I feel it necessary for me to provide the reader with a disclaimer on what I do not hope to accomplish in this exploration. The most critical point that I wish to draw attention to here is the fact that art teachers are not in any way qualified to engage in art therapy with their students. As I stated previously, art therapists are professionals who are highly credentialed and receive an education very different from that of an art teacher. Art therapists are clinically trained, and the dangers
associated with an art teacher trying to function as an art therapist for their students are almost enough of a deterrent to keep a boundary between the two. However, it is my opinion that a basic understanding of art therapy and some of the principles and philosophies that it is rooted in could prove to be very beneficial to art educators in terms of improving their practice. It is my belief that continual improvement and innovation in how we approach our teaching will help art education to continue to develop and to secure its place as a rightful and important part of the quality education that every child is able to receive.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The question that my body of research is based on is: how might art therapy be used to inform art education? I understand that this question could be answered in many different ways, and to better understand it, I further consider sub-questions which I also feel are relevant to this exploration. These include: how have art education and art therapy interacted before? What do other people think about connecting the two? What are some possible explanations for this disconnect between the disciplines of art therapy and art education? How have they come to be? What are the limitations in terms of how art therapy can be used by art educators who do not have specific art therapy training? Can art therapy actually contribute to art education in a meaningful and practical manner? Generally speaking, this thesis explores the possibilities for inclusion of art therapy, and opens up a conversation as to what specific elements might be suitable or unsuitable for classroom use. My goal is not to create a prescriptive outline of how I think art therapy should be used to inform a traditional art curriculum, but rather to consider what could be
possible and what could be useful for classroom teachers at a remedial level. I will explore my own practice, and relate some of the ideas that have been generated in this inquiry to my approach, pedagogy, and ideologies as an art educator.

MY EXPERIENCE

These questions began to take root for me shortly following my graduation from Ohio University in Athens, Ohio in 2005. I was fortunate to have been able to have the opportunity to work as an employee at Passion Works, an art studio for adults with disabilities. I have always had an interest in working with disadvantaged populations, and was immediately drawn to Passion Works through a classified ad placed in the local paper calling for a studio assistant. I remember the surprise I felt while touring ATCO, Athens County's training and employment center for arts with disabilities, in which Passion Works was housed. Within the walls of the dismal, cinder block building, I was led between work stations at which adults with varying degrees of physical and mental disabilities carefully assembled pens of all varieties. As I followed closely through a maze of work spaces, we rounded a corner and entered a completely different space. The studio we entered, the heart of Passion Works, seemed to glow with color and enthusiasm as several of the artists joked with each other while gathered over their work around the central table. I did not yet have any idea what I was seeing, but knew immediately that I wanted very much to be a part of it.

When I was hired as an employee at Passion Works, I was placed in charge of the retail end of the studio. It was still a fairly new concept, my new position included marketing and promoting the organization, as well as manning the store and assembling
some of the production pieces Passion Works sold. During my time there, I was surprised to discover that the founder of Passion Works, Patty Mitchell, was not formally trained to work with adults with disabilities, and what they did in the studio was never given the formal title of art therapy. I remember Patty telling me the story of how she seemingly organically culminated Passion Works from a personal interest in creating art with people with disabilities which motivated her to volunteer at ATCO. She quickly observed how her volunteer artists were able to be very expressive in what they created, and began to communicate deep feelings and thoughts with her and in their work that they had not engaged with otherwise. Patty began to consider what could happen if she brought other, non-disabled artists into the studio to collaborate and help provide learning experiences for the new artists, and began to sell these artworks, eventually providing a sustainable source of income that could replace that provided by pen assembly.

It was not until many years later that I began to realize that what I had witnessed as adults with disabilities interacted with artists and collaboratively created incredible works of art was indeed a form of art therapy. What was most impressive to me at the time was the degree of emotion that the creation of these artworks brought up for many of the artists. Many of these adults were not given a voice, often their disabilities prevented them from being able to verbally communicate with those around them. Many of them lacked the social skills necessary for them to effectively express who they were and what their experiences had been. But when they were asked about their art, they often relayed incredible stories about crushes they had on famous singers, their boyfriends or girlfriends, and traumatic experiences that they had. Many of them became my close
friends, and opened up to me in ways I am sorry to say but had not imagined possible. I have never before nor have I since had that same feeling that I did sitting in the studio at Passion Works, engaging with the artists at work there, and being able to find a means to communicate and work so closely together through art. They were able to teach me so much about human nature, and to truly and directly provide me with a look into their lives and their world through the art they created.

Ever since my employment at Passion Works ended the following year, and I moved away to pursue other things, I have maintained the desire to form that same feeling of connection and understanding that I achieved in my time at Passion Works, and hope to develop it again with my students in my art classroom. I hope that following this shift for me from participant to facilitator, I will be able to draw on my experiences at Passion Works, and to combine them with my formal training in art education, and exploration into art therapy, to begin to cultivate a similar type of relationship again. I am not only referring to the relationship between teacher and student, but among and between students (artists) as well.

That experience began to develop my interest in art therapy, which I hoped to be able to pursue as I completed my masters degree here at The Ohio State University. The merits of the art education program here have been made clear to me from day one, when I attended orientation, and the program was defined as “the top-ranking art education program in the country”. Surely here I would find at least some trace of art therapy at some point in some class in which I enrolled, or some opportunity to talk about it. However, as I finished up my last quarter of coursework, including as many disability
studies classes as I could find that were even somewhat related to these interests, I have been faced with the surprising realization that not only is art therapy completely left out of the curriculum, but many of my professors and colleagues have been uncomfortable with my even introducing it into a discussion. The typical reaction when I initially discuss my research interests has not always been positive; many of my colleagues put up a wall when I bring it up as they get stuck on the fact that they are not art therapists, and cannot seem to move past that idea to really consider what I am talking about in any other way. I have found encouragement, however, in continued exploration of this idea and continued discussion, and in discovering that there are other published accounts wherein the same suggestion has been made.

I recently had the opportunity to take a class with Dr. Sydney Walker; Critical Contemporary Theory. One day in class, while feeling particularly lost and bogged down in the seemingly endless possibilities that theory can generate, I was able to find justification for the idea of using one discipline to inform another, while still maintaining a separation between the two. This happened in an article Dr. Walker wrote with some of her graduate students that developed from Lacan-based study sessions. Dr. Walker is interested in the study of visual culture, and in this article titled “Complicating Visual Culture”, she uses a framework of psychoanalytic theory to explore subjectivity and meaning-making. She emphasizes in this article that educators are not psychoanalysts, and that she is not utilizing this framework to provide possibilities for how they might function as such. Instead, she uses Lacanian psychoanalytic theory to provide new ways for looking at various aspects of the field to inform it and to encourage its development.
and advancement. This closely reflects my thoughts on how art therapy might effectively be incorporated into art education; not for the purposes of teaching art educators how to act as therapists, but to further complicate it, and to inform new possibilities.

I also believe that art therapy has the potential to provide art educators with a new lens through which they can begin to understand who their students are by what they are expressing through their art. Art education is based in instruction. It is common practice for art educators to consider a technical aspect of art, to address this aspect through a lesson plan that is designed to teach students a particular methodology, technique, or use of a particular material like ceramics or photography, and for the focus to be on superficial qualities of art-making such as perspective, line quality, saturation of color, and perspective. Many art teachers do consider the subjects that students choose to consider in their art-making as being anything but secondary to other considerations, such as a students use of materials or whether or not a student was able to correctly use a particular methodology to achieve a certain result. As in other subjects, art education is based around standards and benchmarks developed and implemented by the individual states. Effective art teachers are not typically concerned with what their students are including in their work and why, but rather whether or not they have adequately covered the information that has been formally deemed important by authoritative governing bodies.

On the contrary, art therapy is not instructive in nature. Although some arts instruction may be necessary so that art-making can take place, the goal of art therapy is not to create artists or to teach students about art history, but to provide a “...means of
connecting what is inside us—our thoughts, feelings, and perceptions—with outer realities and life experiences. It is based in the belief that images can help us understand who we are and enhance life through self-expression” (Malchiodi, ix). Thus, art therapy is not concerned with benchmarks and standards, but simply in making art. This approach is often open-ended, and allows for the artist to have a lot of freedom in what they create. This is a fairly common practice among artists, and demonstrates one way that art therapy and art education are inherently connected; through art-making. Technical aspects are of little relevance when compared to the role of the subject in an artwork. The subject can then be considered and analyzed to provide art therapists with what can turn out to be a window into the life of the artists through which elements can and will be exposed that may have been effectively hidden in every other way. This new perspective could be used to give teachers insight that would help them to create a curriculum that is student-centered and student-driven, based on and rooted in the students as individuals in terms of their interests, beliefs, and experiences.

One of the most interesting phenomena that has occurred throughout my life is in how one thing inevitably and unpredictably leads to another; and if I pay attention I often find myself in the right place at the right time without even knowing how I got there. Just such a scenario has recently worked its way into my life in this last quarter of school as I have been writing this thesis exploring art therapy. Service has always been important to me and I am constantly on the lookout for new volunteer opportunities. One such opportunity knocked on the front door of my inbox from the Ohio State University's list-serve several months ago; a local school was looking for someone to volunteer to teach
art classes to preschoolers with varying degrees of hearing impairments. Not only am I very interested in art therapy and in working with students with disabilities, but I have experience teaching preschool and really enjoy working with that age group.

Since then, I have been at a school I will call North Elementary twice a week, where I teach four different classes of preschoolers, ages 3-5, who have varying levels of hearing impairments and other disabilities. A large part of my role at North Elementary has been to design lesson plans that I can implement in 30 minute periods (including set-up and clean-up) that are not reliant on oral instructions. This has not been an easy task and has required me to re-think how I approach my pedagogy in this setting. I would be lying if I didn't say that this experience has been extremely frustrating for me at times, in part due to the fact that I have received no training in working with this specific population. But when I reflect on the source of my frustration, I have often found that it is primarily derived in how I am approaching this experience and on my pre-conceptions of how it should be. The truth of the matter is, this is a very young age group, and to focus on the product is a ridiculous notion that is unrealistic; these students really are doing very well to engage in the process. My goal as their teacher is not to show them how to make something that looks a certain way, but to help them learn how to use the materials and to work creatively. I rely on the help of the other teachers in my classes, and several of them do not share this same perspective. I will re-visit this experience later in this research, and reconsider how what I am learning about art therapy might be helpful to me here.
In this inquiry, I am localizing and concentrating my research to visual art education and art therapy in the U.S., and guiding my research through framework of critical pedagogy in hopes of arriving at information and possibilities for improving a traditional approach to art education, from which art therapy remains separate. I hope that in utilizing this framework for my research, I can begin to develop ideas that may or may not warrant further research, that may eventually lead to a change in teacher training to include a basic understanding of art therapy, and a move toward understanding students in a more profound way based on their art that comes from allowing them to freely express themselves and to be creative. Critical pedagogy lends itself to my research in that it provides a justification for exploratory research of this type, and helps to frame my ideas and research as a defined approach, while situating its significance beyond this thesis itself.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

Paulo Freire is one of the most prominent and well-known theorists associated with critical pedagogy, and he is widely accredited with its development and incorporation into education as a valid approach that can act to provide education with new systems for understanding and interacting, which can ultimately revolutionize education. In the introduction to *Pedagogy of Freedom*, Distinguished Professor of Sociology and Cultural Studies from the City University of New York effectively summarized the reciprocity in learning that I would like to begin to develop between art education and art therapy. He said, “Education takes place when there are two learners who occupy somewhat different spaces in an ongoing dialogue. But both participants
bring knowledge to the relationship, and one of the objects of the pedagogical process is to explore what each knows and what they can teach each other.” (Freire, 8). I think that this statement rings true when art education and art therapy are seen as the two participants; their knowledge is different, but they are both rooted in art and have the ability to teach each other. I will include a more in-depth introduction to critical pedagogy as a part of my methodology section, in order to greater contextualize my approach to this body of research. I use a generic approach to qualitative research in this paper; my methodological approach to this study will primarily be focused around a critical review of literature centered around interactions between art education and art therapy, and a critical examination of various aspects of art therapy from the perspective of an art educator steeped in critical pedagogy. Thus, I act as a filter in this body of research, and the results that are generated are largely deductive in nature.

Within this framework, I will consider the perspectives of some highly influential people, many of whose theories continue to inform art education and art therapy still today. One of the most prominent is Viktor Lowenfeld, who was a major figure in the development of art education and art therapy both. Lowenfeld's book *Creative and Mental Growth* (1947) is one of if not the single most influential text book in art education, and has been used by many teacher preparation programs (Jarboe, 2002). It explored ways that art is tied to creativity, and defined six stages of artistic development as can be seen in child artwork, which came out of the many years of study he spent dedicated to working with students who were blind or otherwise disabled. Lowenfeld demonstrated direct connections between these stages and psychosocial development, and
in doing so used art therapy to inform art education. Although met with some criticism, Lowenfeld developed what he called 'art education therapy', which essentially was a means of providing art education to students with disabilities and remaining sensitive to the value of personal expression in dealing with frustrations and self-definition (Rubin, 1999).

Another major figure who contributed to both art education and art therapy was Margaret Naumburg. Naumburg, like Lowenfeld, was highly influenced by psychoanalytic theory, and believed that art was a direct route to unconscious symbolic contents (Rubin, 1999). Naumburg started a school, the Walden school, in which she studied "the emotional development of children, fostered through encouragement of spontaneous creative expression and self-motivated learning, (which) should take precedence over the traditional intellectual approach to the teaching of a standardized curriculum" (Detre, 1983, pg. 116). This, psychoanalytic theory directly informed her approach to education. Other theorists working in the early stages of art education and art therapy include Florence Cane, who was actually Naumburg's sister and was hired as an art teacher at Walden school, and Edith Kramer, who went from artist to art educator to art therapist following her move to the United States during World War II, adding to each profession and developing the connections between them. These figures, along with others working alongside them, collectively helped to push art education to adopt a more progressive approach that included a focus on the student and the development of their creativity and personal identity through art education.
More recently, I have come across the work of Sharyl Parashak, a professor at Southern Illinois University who has designed a teacher preparation class that brings art therapy concepts to elementary art education, and believes that art therapy can lend itself to art education in terms of teaching students with special needs (Parashak, 1997). Barbara Bush helped to introduce art therapy to public schools in Florida in the 1980s, and described it's purpose as helping severely disabled students that teachers were not adequately trained to administer to, while providing training to art teachers so that they might understand the essentials of child development as related to art, provide background information on the nature of various disabilities and how to approach them, and to demonstrate the potential of an art therapy program and the ways that it could provide assistance to students with special needs (Bush, 1997). The literature review section of this paper includes a further discussion of such theoretical underpinnings that provide support for my ideas within this body of research.

LIMITATIONS

This study has definite and pronounced limitations, and I hope that it will act to lay a foundation on which further research can be built. I hope to engage in my research further and to continue to develop it when I am teaching in an art education classroom. It is my goal to form a preliminary body of research from which to draw ideas and conclusions to revisit later and more extensively. The most obvious limitation, in tune with a qualitative research approach, is that I am not going to arrive at a succinct answer, nor any number of succinct answers, but merely to raise further questions and to consider new possibilities. My research will also be limited by my own positionality as a student.
in art education having limited practical experience working in the field of art education. This factor can also prove to be advantageous, as it will allow my thinking to remain primarily theoretical for the time being, and not be limited by practicality or contextuality. I do not have the voice of doubt ringing through my head when I consider the possibilities for including elements of art therapy in art education. My pedagogy is only beginning to take shape, and I hope that this research will help me to develop new ways to consider my ideologies and philosophies regarding my role as an art educator, in turn opening up new spaces and applications for art therapy.

Unfortunately, practical limitations of time, space, and resources also limit this body of research. These limitations can also be looked at advantageously in this case as they force a sort of summarization of ideas, which is crucial to the concept of opening up possibilities for further investigation. This discussion could proceed endlessly, and I am in no way an authority on either art education or art therapy, which may raise some questions on the validity of my ideas. However, it is in keeping with the concept that this is merely a body of research, not a manual or a users guide, that allows me to present this information in a way that gives it a voice, without being a voice of authority. It is my hope that this body of research will be used primarily by the field of art education in order to develop it in new ways that both complicate what it is while in turn providing possibilities for how it might look, and could improve.

This inquiry follows art education and art therapy from their introduction in the United States, beginning with a historical depiction of how they came to be, what influences they have shared in the past, and some of the key figures in their development.
I consider the development of their respective professional organizations, and create a bigger picture that seats them both contextually within significant events that have shaped the social climate. I explain my approach to this study, and consider the work of others who have conceived of and supported similar ideas. And in analyzing my own pedagogy and experience, I reflect on direct connections that have surfaced for me that have led me to believe that art education and art therapy are inherently connected, and ways that I believe art therapy has already begun to inform my practice.
Chapter 2: Methodology

This body of research is qualitative in nature. According to *Qualitative Research in Education*, qualitative research is loosely defined as “...a general term. It is a way of knowing in which a researcher gathers, organizes, and interprets information obtained using his or her eyes and ears as filters...It can be contrasted heavily with quantitative research, which relies heavily on hypothesis testing, cause and effect, and statistical analysis” (Lichtman, 2010, p.5). This is a necessary decision regarding the goals of this study and the nature of the researchable material that I examine. No part of this is study will be quantitative, thus it cannot efficiently or logically be assigned any kind of a mathematical value; it is very much based in discovering and exploring the natures of and possibilities that exist in connecting art education and art therapy. This study is primarily developed around a critical interpretation of literature and associated implications regarding how art education and art therapy have interacted and may interact successfully in the future (or, not, should my research instead uncover this possibility), and I will seek to apply these ideas to my practice.

Characteristics of qualitative research that are reflected in my research include but are not limited to the major points of qualitative research epistemology as described by Wiersma (2000); phenomena that are viewed holistically, flexibility in design and
openness to what is being collected, study of perceptions to make meaning, and care
given to avoiding a priori assumptions or conclusions in favor of post hoc. My approach
will also take advantage of the funnel approach, in which general questions eventually
narrow to specific phenomenon and more focused conclusions. This approach relies on a
constant and continual process of revision as the focus becomes increasingly narrow
based on the data that is collected.

The methodological nature of this body of research thus is somewhat grounded in
the research itself. I begin this study with a fairly comprehensive overview of the history
of visual art education and art therapy as they have developed in the U.S.. This historical
inquiry leads the reader into a critical examination and reflection of any examples or case
studies that I can find in which art education and art therapy have been used
cooperatively, in whatever terms and to whatever ends my research might discover. From
these examples, I begin to consider the nature of these interactions, how they looked, who
promoted them, and any conclusive data describing the results of these interactions. I will
use this information as both a foundation on which to begin to understand this
relationship as it stands presently, as well as a lens through which to consider any new
possibilities for further inquiry. This aspect of my research is vital to the core of what my
research will produce in terms of providing an anchor to what has been done before,
while concurrently drawing attention and focus to what has not, and what areas of study
have not been considered previously.

In this inquiry, the data that I will be collecting includes interactions between art
education and art therapy, strategies, and suggestions that art therapy might provide for
art education. I will also consider my data in terms of concepts and themes that were
gleaned from my literature review. I consider anything that is repetitive, as repetition has
the potential to emphasize points of commonality. I also consider elements of my own
practice as data, and I examine this data based on other points of inquiry that this study
has generated.

GENERIC QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

The specific type of methodology that I employ in this study is most readily
incorporated into the category of qualitative research that has come to be known simply
as a generic approach. Other terminology has been incorporated as well to describe the
same general idea; also somewhat common are interpretive description and basic or
fundamental qualitative description (Sandelowski, 2010), and, not surprisingly, generic
qualitative studies are among the most common forms of qualitative research in the fields
of education (Merriam, 1998). Much of qualitative research is more narrowly defined,
using specific terminology such as ethnography or phenomenology, but what I hope to
accomplish in this study and what seems to me based on my own experiences and set of
knowledge does not neatly fit into any of these specific groups. I think that Lichtman
(2010) provided a fitting description for my methodology and what I hope to accomplish
in this endeavor in her description of a generic qualitative study as one in which the
researcher acts as the filter for the meaning and one that provides a descriptive outcome
through the use of inductive strategies. Merriam (1998) also described it well as to
“simply seek to discover and understand a phenomenon, a process, or the perspectives
and worldviews of the people involved” (p. 11).
My research does employ components that can be seen as belonging to other types of research methodologies; for example, I utilize constant comparison as I bounce back and forth comparing art education and art therapy— a common approach when using a grounded theory methodology in which the theory arises directly from the research itself. A cultural analysis will also be integral to create an understanding of possible motivations for art education and art therapy to interact and how their interactions might then be employed, but it is not based in fieldwork as would be an ethnography. It also contains aspects of critical theory in that its purpose is to ultimately result in a change in social context, and it is informed by principles of social justice. Using bits and pieces of methodologies as they fit is certainly common practice in many research endeavors.

As I move through my data collection and interpretation, I am careful to present my data in a way that provides a fluid structure in which the various types of data that I collect link together to create a whole body of work instead of a series of disjointed pieces, which is one of the challenges in this type of study as it does not adhere strictly to one particularly methodology. One idea that I have been drawn to that best describes how I see myself proceeding through this research is a term that Denzin & Lincoln (2000) termed an interpretive bricoleur. An interpretive bricoleur is a researcher who allows the questions to determine how the research proceeds and one who uses parts of various methods, methodologies, strategies, and epistemologies and combines them in a way that makes sense for that researcher in their particular body of research. “The interpretive bricoleur produces a bricolage- that is, a pieced-together set of representations that is fitted to the specifics of a complex situation” (pg. 4). As such, I can proceed through my
research with this thought in mind, and put together my methodology as I see it to be most suiting as my work develops. This explains how my sub-questions have been generated and also provides a justification for how and why they might change.

CRITICAL PEDAGOGY

The theoretical underpinnings of my research are primarily grounded in critical pedagogy. In order to properly utilize critical pedagogy in my research, the first and absolutely necessary step is to form some sort of understanding of what critical pedagogy actually is. As my research into this topic progresses, I have been pleasantly surprised to see a lack of a precise, succinct definition as provided by any author who has written very much on the subject. The most prominent theorist associated with critical pedagogy is without question Paulo Freire, and his work has proven to be an excellent starting point for my research. As I have moved through other work, I have read many definitions, but it seems as though each has been accompanied with a disclaimer to the reader that they are not providing the only definition, only one of many.

Although this lack of clarity was initially somewhat frustrating for me to accept, as I further explored the concept my frustration came to be replaced with a strange sort of admiration and acceptance. The reason that this lack of a definition is something that I can now see in a positive light is that it has been replaced by many varying, and often situational, ways that critical pedagogy can be applied and manipulated specifically. It is not a universal theory or methodology that transfers neatly between situations; but is to be more of a process that depends very much on the individual circumstances and can include a huge number of possible ways to proceed, variables to consider, and
conclusions that can be drawn. There are certainly governing and essential components in a critical pedagogy approach, but there is also an innate flexibility in its design. The researchers own experiences and sets of knowledge, as well as what historical context has been acknowledged is only one aspect that can account for some of these considerations. In this way, critical pedagogy does not seek to provide limitations or directions, but possibilities.

Wink (2000) provided several ways that critical pedagogy might be defined, and also emphasized how critical pedagogy by nature seeks to examine the links between teaching and learning. These definitions included components such as looking for new ways of knowing and seeing, and really described the focus of critical pedagogy as being an examination of relationships. The relationships that come into play in teaching and learning are incredibly diverse, and critical pedagogy is designed so that these relationships can be critically considered. They could be any of the following, but are not limited to; classroom teaching, knowledge production, administration and institutional structures, and can be stretched to approach more broad contexts, such as greater society, the community, even global aspects that have an impact on pedagogy. In this way, critical pedagogy provides a way of complicating the basic teacher-student relationship, and it would be interesting to similarly complicate the therapist-student relationship in art therapy. Critical pedagogy at its root helps to generate ways to see and understand teaching and learning on a much wider and more profound level as it considers everything at play instead of trying to isolate particular factors.
Shor (1992) provided the most inclusive definition that I have found to explain critical pedagogy,

“Habits of thought, reading, writing, and speaking which go beneath surface meaning, first impressions, dominant myths, official pronouncements, traditional cliches, received wisdom, and mere opinions, to understand the deep meaning, root causes, social context, ideology, and personal consequences of any action, event, object, process, organization, experience, text, subject, policy, mass-media, or discourse,” (p. 129).

The more that I am able to draw from critical pedagogy, the more I feel as though I have found something that fits. Much of what I hope to accomplish and the ways I will go about doing so in this research can be understood through the lens that critical pedagogy has provided for me. This investigation commences with a historical examination so that I can provide some context with which to try to understand how art education and art therapy have developed over time. Through this endeavor, I hope to gain what McLaren and Kincheloe (2010) call 'political clarity'. Political clarity is defined as an “...ongoing process of examining and seeking to understand economic and sociopolitical realities that shape lives as well as the capacity to transform such material and symbolic conditions,” (pg. 264). They see this as a crucial component to better instruct, protect, and advocate for students, and I see this as a crucial endeavor for me in similar terms, and this is what I hope my research accomplishes if only on the most remedial of levels. Political clarity is not really presented in terms of an option for teachers who want to improve, but instead as a responsibility that every teacher has to intervene and to make things better for their students. I feel that my unique positionality
and set of experiences has led me to consider art therapy how it can improve art education in this way for my research. I do feel a responsibility greater than that of fulfilling my degree requirements in conducting this study; I think I am here and thinking this way at this time for a reason, and it is my duty to pursue something that I believe in so adamantly.

I embrace the challenge that critical pedagogy presents to reconsider dominant hegemonies, practices, ideologies, and structures that produce and sustain inequalities and oppressivity. I do not think that the purpose of excluding art therapy from art education has necessarily had this purpose in mind, but I also do not think that either art education nor art therapy have really considered the implications in these terms. Art therapy provides educators with additional possibilities for working with students with disabilities (Parashak, 1997), and in this way its disregard has indeed resulted directly in limiting the ability of teachers to successfully and optimally engage with these students in the art classroom. Although there are other justifications for this separation, when it is considered in this way it can be seen as incredibly consequential and crucial to best practice that this separation is addressed and reconsidered. Marginalizing and excluding students with disabilities is a practice that has, unfortunately been carried on for years in the American educational system, and I do not think it is one that has always been void of malintent.

As I have progressed through graduate school, some of the literature that I have been exposed to has helped me to begin to understand why and how some of the basic components of the American educational system as I understand it have come to be. This
new knowledge, combined with my existing set of knowledge and experience, has collectively helped me to generate what Paulo Freire called “epistemological curiosity” which he described as “the readiness and eagerness of a conscious body that is open to the task of engaging a body of knowledge” (Leistyna, Woodrum, & Sherblom, 1996, pg. 199). Although I was not aware of this nomenclature before reading this dialogue between Freire and Donaldo Macedo, I think that my epistemological curiosity has been building for some time now. This idea has slowly taken root over time; I included it in my Letter of Intent written as a part of my application to enroll in graduate school and have revisited it as much as possible in various courses that I have taken over the past two years. This idea strongly resonated in a research class that I took, and from there I have grown increasingly curious about it and excited to explore art therapy and art education as a research topic. This topic has developed very organically for me in this way, and I hope that this authentic interest that I have will help to motivate my work and to satisfy my own curiosity while contributing a body of research that is both innovative and substantial to the field of art education.

I think that critical pedagogy provides me with a framework on which to build my investigation, and provides suggestions for components to consider, without forcing me into a prescriptive methodology that doesn't really fit my research. Critical pedagogy also has acted to validate my research and my examination of practices and established beliefs while providing an emancipatory motivation for doing so. Giroux and McLaren ( in Leistyna, Woodrum, & Sherblom, 1996) give consideration to the role of teacher training in that it “should be inextricably linked to critically transforming the school setting and
the wider societal setting” (p. 303) as opposed to uncritical tools of the workforce. I hope that this research might ultimately act to do just that by demonstrating how art therapy could potentially transform teacher education so that a more broad spectrum of students and student ability levels may be effectively taught in the art education classroom.

Beyond that, in utilizing a generic approach to my research and providing critical pedagogy as my guiding lens, I think that I have a unique opportunity to explore the ways that art therapy and art education have and might influence and intersect with each other. This methodology allows me to analyze data in a way that I personally believe to be most fitting, and will also help me to connect my findings in a logical manner that can be supported by critical pedagogy and a reflective and interpretive approach to gathering my research.

DATA COLLECTION

More specifically, I proceed in this study, as previously stated, beginning with a critical historical examination of art education and art therapy separately from one another to provide context for the reader and myself to better understand how each has developed and come to be. My next step is to consider how the two have interacted in the past, and to consider and provide possibilities for how they might interact and engage with one another in the future. My research culminates with a reflection and reconstruction of various pieces of data that I have collected in a way that develops a cohesive representation of some of the various aspects of art education and art therapy that my research consider, and I then consider how my own practice and how I see my role as an art educator. This inquiry is guided by initial concepts and develops from there.
as I collect and organize my data, maintaining the ability to be shifted or modified according to what unsurfaces as I move through the data.

Data analysis contains four basic components; reduction, reflection, taking apart/analyzing, and recombining/synthesis (Wellington, 2000). Although my exploration is broad, the focus of my research will remain narrow. The limitation presented by the volume of material that I am able to find that considers directly what I am researching is somewhat challenging, but results in the advantage of being able to provide a more inclusive interpretation that offers information from many different and often contrasting points of view. I will be thus creating a more accurate depiction of the whole, rather than having the potential ability to narrow my perspective on the issue according to what I might want the results to determine, thereby adding an element of validity to my study.

My research is categorized into chapters, and then further categorized from there so that common themes or disparities can be supported, and a logical connection can be made, making the data accessible and understandable to any reader regardless of background knowledge. I am not a 'post-it' person, and I prefer to work from paper rather than electronically, so my data is collected on loose leaf notebook paper with each source on a separate sheet. I use different colors of ink to denote the different chapters, and I simply check off each area as I include it in my work. It is important to me in this study to utilize primary sources whenever possible, and I make a point of doing so when I gather my research. I have found this to be a beneficial approach not only in that it helps my research to maintain validity, but also in that it often had led me somewhat rhizomatically to other sources that have also helped to add to my data collection,
providing a number of points of departure from which to consider this study. I think that some of my most successful attempts at data collection have stemmed from a review of sources cited by other authors in that it has helped me to generate sources that I might not have found otherwise that are often completely relevant to my own work.

In this way, this body of research is primarily based on an analytical review of literature to pick out parts that I have determined are relevant to this particular study. Constant comparison was used extensively as I continually bounced back and forth, comparing elements that may be shared between art education and art therapy. Criticality and reflection were crucial components to a successful exploration. These were two principles that generally helped to guide everything that I do as I moved through this study. I hoped to revisit and reconsider my data as it becomes increasingly voluminous, and my perspective on and capacity for understanding and interpreting the research grew. In this way, I was able to move through my findings and present my research in a logical manner that was developed largely from the data that I collected, but that was guided by the questions that I laid forth. I proceeded as much as possible without bias; I was not sure what my results would say, and I am happy to have the data speak for itself in determining how my research concluded and what possible implications may be drawn from it.

It is necessary for me at this point to admit that I certainly hope that my research will prove sufficient in demonstrating possibilities for how art therapy might be used effectively to positively impact art education, but I entered into it with an open mind, as I understand that it is certainly possible, perhaps even probable, that my research may
serve to actually discredit this idea. What I am suggesting in this work is somewhat
controversial, and could be detrimental if it is taken out of context or not taken seriously
and cautiously, with much thought being given to how art therapy might be included in
art education, and much understanding as to why and how to include it. In other words, it
is conceivable that an art educator might think that in gaining a basic understanding of art
therapy, it is appropriate for them to act as a therapist to students, which is precisely what
I want to avoid in this study. However, I am hopeful that in providing a contextual
component in my research I have been successful in dispelling any activity of this sort.

The following chapter includes a historical description of some of the most
influential events, persons, and philosophies that have shaped the development of art
education. This literature review follows art education and art therapy in the United
States, and considers any instances that I have been able to find in which art education
and art therapy have been connected. It includes a critical examination of literature, in
which any emergent trends are emphasized, that can then be considered in terms of how
they might impact my practice and ideologies.
Chapter 3: Literature Review

In the previous sections, I provided information describing the nature of the question that this body of research explored, and specific details regarding how I proceeded over the following sections. As I utilized a generic approach to qualitative research in this study and it was primarily developed from books, articles, and other documents, this chapter is substantial in size. In the first sections, I have chosen to weave together the pieces of information that I have found regarding the historic aspects of art education and art therapy in a way that creates a sort of whole picture, instead of describing them piece by piece. My purpose in including these sections is to provide a background to begin to understand what art education and art therapy are, and how they came to be, in order to develop possibilities and consider how they might overlap or be used in conjunction with one another. Csikszentmihalyi (1996) provides further justification for such an exploration, “Developing historical consciousness is an impetus to cultivating the creativity required to revolutionize content and methodology of a field or domain”. This historical investigation acts to provide greater perspective for understanding both disciplines and how they have developed within a broader social context, and I highlight some of the over-arching trends in historical developments and work to connect the two in terms of how they have interacted and possibly influenced one
another over time. The first two sections are largely a critical analysis of historic literature, in which I emphasize events, theories, ideologies, and prominent historical figures that have acted to influence both disciplines, and may continue to be sources of influence on their interactions still today.

The last section of my literature review examines documentation in which connections have been made between art education and art therapy. These intersections vary greatly in nature, and examples of them have proven to be scarce and somewhat difficult to find. Interestingly enough, I found a number of sources who also were interested in connecting art education and art therapy, some of which in very different ways than I would have thought of on my own. Throughout this chapter, I seek to establish a context, in which interactions can be better understood and further explored.

HISTORY OF ART EDUCATION

Providing a concise yet ample history of art education in the United States is not a simple task for several reasons, primarily given the multifaceted and complex nature of art education and of its historical origins. It is impossible to entirely exclude cultural influences from outside of the United States, and doing so would negate the validity of such a history, as it has in many ways been contingent and reliant on the development of art and art education in other countries. Other factors that act to further complicate this exploration can be primarily attributed to the documentation of art education in the United States, which is anything but comprehensive and depends largely on the perspectives of a small number of people working in and around a field that continues to evolve and change, and is practiced in different ways by different people with different
objectives. This complexity of interactions is ever-changing, and knows no distinct barriers. The formation of the National Art Education Association has acted to provide some unity to the field, but to try to tie together all of the pieces that make up art education today would be like trying to succinctly describe the history of the United States itself—there is no one answer.

The majority of information reflected in this chapter on the history of art education in the United States comes primarily from three sources; The History of art education: Proceedings from the Second Penn State conference (1989), Eflands A History of Art Education (1990), and Smiths The History of American Art Education (1996). Additional sources include articles and bits and pieces from other sources, but these three represent the most relevant sources to my research. All three work to provide representations of art educations historical developments, and each do so in very different ways. The History of art education: proceedings from the Second Penn State conference (1989) was developed from a conference hosted by the National Art Education Association (NAEA), and perhaps offers the most breadth, but is not readable as a holistic piece as its parts are not connected, except under broad headings such as “central themes”, “international perspectives”, and “social context”. The goal of this text is apparently to gather together a diverse body of information and to provide context, but not in a unified fashion.

The NAEA produced another collection of work relating to the history of art education titled Framing the Past (1990), which claims to be the first collection of a “first full generation of historical discussion in art education” (p. xii). It also emphasizes the
need for further study in many areas of art education; ideas, leaders, influential programs, the nature of art education, continuities, research, and the who-what-where-when-why-how. In other words, no part of art educations history has been thoroughly nor adequately explored and described. Similar thoughts were echoed in other sources that I consulted; a need for further study seemed to be one of few continuities that occurred in comparing my sources. Smith (1996) echoes similar sentiments, claiming orphan status for art education and noting ambiguity in on overall historical explanation of a discipline with “varied and scattered roots” (p. 3).

Art education outside of the United States can be traced back to some of the earliest known Greek philosophers Plato and Aristotle, whose writings on education and the role of the arts continue to be influential still today (Efland, 1990). Even these early ideologies valued the aesthetic qualities of the arts and recognized their importance as instruments of cultural maintenance. Art education grew and continued to develop, but it was not until several major events took place simultaneously during the formative years of the United States in the late eighteenth century that collectively pushed art into education. Prior to the Industrial Revolution, “art education for all but professional artists came to be viewed as a luxury pursuit, having no useful purpose” (pg. 48). Puritan beginnings did very little to encourage art education, as they placed primary emphasis on the word and saw visual and tactile things to be mere distractions (Smith, 1993). Rural schools of this time were largely unconcerned with the aesthetic, and art education in these situations was limited by the education of the teachers themselves, which rarely included specialized art training. This attitude changed, however, as the Industrial
Revolution brought about urbanization, giving art a practical and necessary purpose, and a direct link to economic gain. This, along with the American Revolution and separation from the monarchy, as well as a rise in romanticism, which valued originality and beauty in art, helped to secure art education, giving it a meaningful and permanent position in society. Art also became a commodity during these early years as its patronage was extended to the middle class and collectors began to expand their collections from fine art to also include other wares such as furnishings, textile designs, and musical instruments.

1794 marked the beginning of the short-lived Academy of Art in Philadelphia, which offered studio classes and the first exhibitions of American art (Efland, 1990). In 1807 the first successful art school, the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts opened. It soon began hosting annual exhibitions and became the site of the first national academy of artists. Many of these early institutions closely imitated their European precedents. 1826 marked the establishment of the National Academy of Design in New York, including an art student’s league and an emphasis on developing art studies and sharing information. Other schools followed, accommodating both industrial design and fine arts training such as Cooper Union, Pratt Institute, and the Rhode Island School of Design.

From the Industrial Revolution was spawned the 'common school movement', from which state supported schooling emerged in order to create a workforce that could supply the growing demands of industry (Efland, 1990). Art during this time was seen as a learnable skill that did not require talent to acquire, and also as masculine-practical, purposeful, and logical. One of the earliest attempts to integrate art education into public schools was made by Horace Mann, who in 1844 published Peter Schmid's system of
drawing instruction. This booklet became a base for art education and its purpose was to provide non-artist teachers to teach students not planning to be artists, but employees (Smith, 1996). A noted benchmark in the history of American art education followed shortly after, when Walter Smith, a British educator and drawing master, introduced the Massachusetts Free Instruction in Drawing Act in 1870. This act, also known simply as the Industrial Drawing Act, contained wide provisions for drawing instruction in schools. Similar to Schmid's system, the objective was to create efficient and knowledgeable workers, who could then be employed in manufacturing. There is some controversy surrounding Smith's forced departure from three positions; supervisor of drawing in the schools of the State of Massachusetts and the City of Boston, as well as Principalship of the Massachusetts Normal Art School. Smith (1996) considered several possible explanations for this dismissal. These possibilities include political demagoguery, public dislike of any non-utilitarian taxes, specialized art teachers fearing they will lose their jobs to general teachers, and a monopoly on public drawing materials. Whatever the reason, the Massachusetts Free Instruction in Drawing Act remains one of the most marked points in this period. Teachers during this period were largely dependent on commercial houses, from which they acquired supplies, equipment, subject matter, copy books, and other aids. In this respect, publishers and school supply houses thus dominated art education in public schools for many years (Whitford, 1923).

Beginning in the late 1800s, Picture Study was born, which would remain an outstanding element in American public schools for more than 50 years (Efland, 1990). Picture Study was able to develop as new technology was being created that was able to
effectively and cheaply mass-produce art reproductions, giving access to a greater population. Picture Study was a part of a shift from art education merely as an industrial skill. Whitford (1923) included a relevant statement that describes the changing philosophy behind this movement from a report on school art in Boston released in 1882:

Art education, even for little children, means something more than instruction in drawing...Teachers should consider them as such, and should direct their teaching to creating in the minds of their pupils a correct conception of simple forms, rather than to giving instruction merely in drawing...The instruction is to be varied and rational, the aim being not to make proficient in any one thing, but to impart a taste, a knowledge, and a skill of universal utility. (p. 110)

It was not until the rise of romanticism that art began to be appreciated for and emphasized in terms of its ability to equate with high moral purpose. This shift was also marked by a shift in gender; women were thought to be morally superior to men and thus more suited to teaching art. According to Efland (1990), this marked the beginning of and provided justification for an increasing number of women in art education. Smith (1996) also noted a rise in feminism during this time, and a number of significant contributions made by women. Some of these were Margaret Mathias, who authored three widely used textbooks, Belle Boas, editor of Art Education Today, and Natalie Robinson Cole, a classroom teacher who emphasized self-expression and encouraged all of her students to be artists in order to better their social and emotional development. Within romanticism,
art education was extended to include art appreciation and natural beauty, and industrial training released its grasp on art, moving to belong instead to vocational training.

Progressive education also began to develop and curriculum became more reflective of children's natural interests instead of training to be part of an industrial workforce. In 1902, John Dewey published *The Child and Curriculum*, in which he modified a subject-oriented curriculum to also emphasize child development (Amburgy in Soucy, 1990). Dewey's influence was lasting in both art education and art therapy as well; he was a major figure in progressive education who believed in art as a means of revealing the inner child. Early child-centered schools emphasized creative self-expression, but restructured themselves during the 1930s to include closer ties to life and the community. A strong proponent of this approach was Franz Cizek, an Austrian who strongly endorsed a creative or self-expression rhetoric. Cizek's influence, while controversial, has secured his place as one of the foundational figures of modern visual arts education. It is seen as controversial in that there are few records of his work, and the records that do exist are not consistent, and often depend on memories recollected by former students. Cizek's work in Vienna, birthplace of psychoanalysis, during the 1920s and 1930s in Vienna, is seen by some as justification for him to be known as creative art education's founding father, while other believe that he brought a false notion of creativity in child art work to art education (Efland, 1990).

World War II (WWII) brought a number of influential immigrants who fled from Europe and carried their own perspectives and culture with them to the United States. They included art historians, Modernist painters, and Bauhaus masters, among others.
WWII was a critical turning point in this way, and some of the founding figures of both art therapy and art education moved into the United States during this time (Efland, 1990). One of these was Friedrich Froebel, a German immigrant who brought kindergarten to the United States, and followed a laissez-faire approach, allowing students to 'unfold creatively'. One of the first public kindergartens in the United States was opened by Elizabeth Peabody, who conducted her own publishing company and studied how student development and expression relate and develop through imagination (Saunders in Soucy, 1990). Other influential persons who immigrated during this time included Henry Schaefer-Simmern and Viktor Lowenfeld, who collectively helped to generate the child study movement, which Smith (1996) cited as a foundation of twentieth century art education, and is seen as the beginning of developmental psychology.

Schaefer-Simmern's pedagogies incorporated ideas such as utilizing artist's self-criticism, details, a formal emphasis, representation, art history, and making conscious decisions in art-making (Smith, 1996). Viktor Lowenfeld is perhaps the most influential figure in art education, and his 1947 text *Creative and Mental Growth* was the most important American art education text for decades. Lowenfeld studied in Vienna, where he was director of art in the Blind Institute around the same time that Freudian psychoanalysis was being developed. Lowenfeld's interests in working with the blind came from his interests in one of his sculpting teachers, Johann Herder, who instructed sculpture students with blindfolds, and believed that the tactile sense was the most valid base for art expression (Michael, 1981). He was interested in the visual (sense of sight)-
haptic (sense of touch) polarity and focused on the psychological aspects of art-making (Smith, 1996). He found the final product to be unimportant, and his socially-oriented curriculum approach considered the affects of socialization on expression. Lowenfeld moved out of Austria and relocated to the United States in 1938 during Hitler's regime (Michael, 1981). In 1939 Lowenfeld began employment at Harvard, and he went on to work as an art therapist at various institutions for children with emotional, mental, and physical disabilities before beginning work at the Hampton Institute in Virginia in 1945, where he would write *Creative and Mental Growth*. In the third edition, published in 1957, a chapter was included entitled “Therapeutic Aspects of Art Education” in which he considered the creative process and its implications for teachers working with students with disabilities, and provided a theoretical basis for merging art education and therapy. This was an extremely influential text, and his work would go on to dominate school visual art education theory in the United States for many years, especially his theory of stages in artistic development (Smith, 1996). Lowenfeld's theories and techniques have been met with some criticism; he has been accused of 'over-psychologizing' art education and emphasizing creativity without reinforcing technical skills. Both Lowenfeld, in his clinical work with the blind and sculpture, and Schaefer-Simmern, in his studies of artwork created while working with people with mental retardation, were intrigued by artwork made by people with disabilities, and studied them at length throughout their careers.

Margaret Naumburg and her sister Florence Naumburg Cane, like Schaeffer-Simmern and Lowenfeld, were also fascinated with revealing “inner images” of the
unconscious and worked diligently to shape art education (Smith, 1996). I will discuss Naumburg further in the following section, as she is seen by many as the mother of art therapy. Cane's focus was on student creativity, and she considered how breathing and movement affected expressionism.

Efland (1990) identified three major “streams of influence,” (pg. 214) affecting art education following WWII and leading to the present: expressionism, reconstructionism, and scientific rationalism. These three streams did not follow a neat and boundaried path but interacted, ebbed, and flowed over time. Expressionism emphasized free unconstrained opportunities for expression in which universal truths would be revealed through children's work and developed largely from (European) romanticism. Proponents of expressionism include Viktor Lowenfeld and Herbert Read, and the child-centered schools that developed from this stream remained dominant from 1945-1960. The 1960s and 1970s marked a popularity in art education as a means to transform society and enliven the school climate, as reflected in a reconstructionist approach. The other major stream identified by Efland (1990), scientific rationalism, was centered around scientific developments as a basis for curriculum reform. This approach is discipline oriented, and it's shift to pre-established educational objectives included ideological considerations such as learning through discovery, and learners acting as their own agents in knowledge production, thus taking on responsibility for their education. There are many overlapping similarities between these streams, thus making it difficult to pinpoint when and where they came into play, and their goals, methods, and aspirations shifted following the social climate of any given point in time.
Other common themes that have worked to shape the history of art education include access, which may vary according to such variables such as age, gender, and class, and an inherent vulnerability that comes with arts status as a privilege, not a necessity. Its history has always been closely contingent to developments within greater society in terms of political, social, cultural, scientific, and economic events (Efland, 1990).

According to Saunders (in Soucy, 1990), the National Art Education Association (NAEA) was organized in 1947 following 65 years of development. The first art education department was added to the National Education Association (NEA) in 1884, and various other regional arts organizations started to appear around the same time. In 1925 the Federal Council of Art Education was formed in the United States to unite these various arts organizations, but its limitations resulted in a quick demise in 1935, when it was replaced by a reinstated art department of the NEA. This art department carried on until 1947 with the official formation of the NAEA, but the regional arts organizations also existed until 1974. *Art Education*, the journal of the NAEA, has been published since 1948, and although the organization follows no prevailing philosophy, its purposes remain to promote art education and national membership.

Efland's (1990) history led up to 1990, however the amount of information included describing art education following WWII is limited in scope. I think that his perceptions of art education at that time still ring true today, 21 years later, which he describes as a sort of pedagogical formalism marked by a conflict between teaching self-expression and teaching content of art. Smith (1996) remarked that modern art education
is defined by a back and forth give-and-take between discipline based art education (DBAE), which gained popularity in the 1980s with the creation of a DBAE centered program designed by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, and a more child-centered approach. This approach is supported by the recent rise of multiculturalism and the concept of a social justice curriculum.

HISTORY OF ART THERAPY

Like art education, art therapy is also multifaceted in origin. In its essence, art therapy stems from the idea that, “healing is an art and art itself can heal,” (Hogan, 2001, pg. 13); from, “mans profound belief in the power of the image and reliance on symbolic expression to heal,” (Rubin, 1999, pg. 90). Its appearance in the United States was dependent on the change in social climate that developed out of psychoanalysis and expression, when art moved from mere representation or a means to create a more effective working class to mean much more, and emphasis changed to consider creativity and self-expression. Art therapy has a longer and more pronounced history in the U.K., from where it developed and spread to the U.S. (Hogan, 2001), and as such I will include some of the most relevant information from that part of its history as well. The following section will demonstrate that there are many similarities between the histories of art education and art therapy; both disciplines note many of the same influential figures and are rooted on many of the same cultural phenomena. These similarities support the idea of commonalities between the two disciplines and help to emphasize them, well at the same time helping to provide a better context for understanding each individually.
Art therapy in the U.K. began to take form in the late 1700s to the early 1800s as institutions began to take interest in what was termed a moral treatment regime (Hogan, 2001). This moral treatment regime marked the beginning of a movement from a physical explanation for a condition of insanity, best treated with physical methodologies (lobotomies, electro-shock therapy, etcetera), to a moral source, wherein effective treatments attempted to allow a patient to assimilate back into society through a newly developed sense of self-control. Early hospital work in the York Retreat and Crichton Royal Hospital in England were some of the first examples of art being used as a part of individual treatment plans, and the art that patients created was beginning to be considered as direct reflections on the patients condition; as such diagnostic tools and windows for practitioners to learn more about their conditions. Early theorists at this time included Sigmund Freud, Carl Jung, and Cesare Lombroso, who were considering possible links between madness and creativity, and emphasized expression through pictorial symbolism. These ideas were pushed farther with the development of surrealism, as it helped to create greater interest in the subconscious, and in the various ways that this subconscious might be expressed. Patient work was closely considered, and exhibitions were held to show it off, inciting numerous debates as to whether it could be considered “real” art, or modern art, or if it fit more readily “the art of the insane” (Hogan, 2001), or possibly a combination of these possibilities. Regardless of what conclusions were drawn and by whom, this type of spontaneous and unrestrained expression was starting to be considered more closely, and to be valued for far more than
it's superficial qualities. These considerations would continue for some time, as
psychoanalysis developed and pushed the envelope even further.

Artists first began work in clinical settings in the United States as early as 1907,
when there was a clay specialist hired to work with patients at Massachusetts General
Hospital (Hogan, 2001). This followed the trend in art education of a move from an
industrial, masculine, practical approach to art to a more progressive, feminine, child-
centered, expressive approach in which art's transformational powers were beginning to
be understood. Under Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, the Works Progress
Administration (WPA) employed artists in the Federal Art Project to offer art classes to
psychiatric patients during the 1930s (Rubin, 1999).

It is not surprising to find many of the same influential figures in the history of
art education played significant parts in the development of art therapy as well. Franz
Cizek is noted for his encouragement that children paint and draw in a natural way.
Lowenfeld was highly efficacious to art therapy as well, in his early work with the blind
and partially sighted, and with a chapter later omitted from Creative and Mental Growth
(1947) describing what he called “art education therapy”. He made sure to emphasize in
this chapter that he was not advocating for teachers to provide counseling (much like I
am doing in this thesis!). Lowenfeld's considerations also included extensive studies of
the psychological value of spontaneous art expression for children. Florence Cane wrote
and published The Artist in Each of Us in 1951, providing methods for evoking creativity
and promoting healing through art (Rubin, 1999).
Also highly influential was the work of Edith Kramer and Margaret Naumburg. Naumburg strongly believed in art as a direct route to unconscious symbolic contents and founded Walden School, rooted in psychoanalysis, as early as 1914 (Hogan, 2001). She believed that art was both a tool in assessment (as in projective testing) and in therapy, and lectured profusely, advocating for art therapy. Kramer's career began as an artist, and she taught art to refugee children in camps during WWII. Following the war she moved to New York City, where she taught art therapy at Wiltwyck, a residential school for disturbed children. Kramer's approach differed from Naumburg's, in that she worked as an adjunct instead of a primary therapist (Rubin, 1999).

One prominent figure in art therapy's history that does not appear in the history of art education is Adrian Hill (Hogan, 2001). Adrian Hill is seen as the pioneer of British art therapy, and was responsible for coining the term in 1942. Hogan (2001) noted his dislike of the term, but that he had chosen it in order to appeal to and to be taken seriously by the medical community. Hill began as a practicing painter and art educator, whose life changed greatly after a diagnosis that he had contracted pulmonary tuberculosis. Hill was hospitalized for treatment, and during his recovery, he began to teach art classes, give demonstrations, and show examples of reproductions to fellow patients. Hill's service in World War I was also an inspiration to him, and he studied post-traumatic stress disorder in soldiers, considering how art could be used to help them through it. Unlike some other theorists working in the field, Hill did not support the belief that art therapy should be used as psychotherapy, nor should it be used simply as a means to generate images to be analyzed, but that it is a valuable form of treatment in and of
itself. One of the most outspoken proponents of art therapy during this time, Hill was noted for explaining art therapy to the Queen in 1946 during a visit with the Royal Family.

Another interesting figure was Marie Paneth, who worked with traumatized children after World War II (Hogan, 2001). Paneth applied for and was granted permission to take over an air-raid shelter on Branch Street in London, where she conducted her own type of art therapy. Paneth's methodology was more or less to act as a facilitator; she would set up a 'buffet' of materials and let the children loose to create whatever they felt like creating. This practice provided one example of libertarian educational projects that were going on during this time, in which the goal was to empower children to be autonomous and to help them to develop a sense of personal responsibility.

The first community to develop that was dedicated to art therapy opened in 1942, The Withymead Centre for Remedial Education through Psychotherapy and the Arts, founded by Gilbert and Irene Champernowne (Hogan, 2001). Withymead supported both resident and non-resident patient/students, and was intended to provide a place of healing for those whose lives had been disturbed by psychological difficulties. In Withymead, the unconscious was held in high regard, as it was seen as the procurer of information. Many variations of art therapy were conducted at Withymead as there were no standards for practice as of yet, and all members of the community, including staff, were seen as participants and therefore open for analysis.
1946 marked the opening of the first art therapy studio in the United States (Rubin, 1999). It was housed in the Menninger Clinic, a part of a Veterans Affairs hospital in Topeka Kansas. Don Jones and Robert Ault were some of the first employees. Both would go on to be on the formative committee of the AATA and were pioneers in developing clinical training programs in art therapy.

The so-called “spontaneous art of the mentally ill” of this time was a source of fascination for some psychiatrists, some of whom collected and analyzed drawings found on walls or scraps of toilet paper or other paper scraps (Rubin, 1999). Some early theorists, such as Paul-Max Simon and Cesare Lombroso, studied this imagery seriously, and were interested in possible links between genius and insanity. This primary process, which includes dreams and reverie, and the unconscious, was often viewed as a puzzle and this imagery perhaps as providing keys to decoding it. An ongoing debate developed from this early curiosity in imagery, and on the relationship between creativity and madness, eventually leading to the formation of the International Society for Psychopathology of Expression (ISPE) in 1959, and then the American Society for Psychopathology of Expression (ASPE) in 1969.

Junge (1994) noted that the American Art Therapy Association or AATA formed from the Art Therapy Association, of which talk began as early as 1966. A group of art therapists attending a meeting of the ISPE grew disenchanted with the dominance of psychiatry, and felt the need to form a separate group that focused on art. They felt a need for acknowledgment as respected mental health professionals, and viewed art as a treatment instead of a mere measure of pathology. Also during this time, in 1966,
Margaret Naumberg published *Dynamic Oriented Art Therapy*, which remains an incredibly influential text. In 1968, the first graduate level training program was developed, and an organizational meeting was held, wherein eighty five art therapists debated over form and structure but eventually drafted the constitution of the AATA. The organization was made official in 1969, only forty years ago, with fifteen dollar dues, a logo designed by Robert Ault, a newsletter put out by the first president of the AATA, Myra Levick, and the first inaugural meeting, held in 1970 at the University of Louisville (Rubin, 1999).

Both art education and art therapy have been greatly influenced by developments in psychoanalysis, many of which occurred during the same time as a rise in a more progressive approach to education (Rubin, 1999). An early fascination with the spontaneous art created by people with mental illness and gathered by psychiatrists led theorists such as Carl Jung and Sigmund Freud to study ways to unlock the primary process and to decode meanings hidden in dreams, reverie, and this art that was created by people with mental illness. This rise in progressive education was marked by an emphasis on creativity and an interest in child development, and prominent theorists working with this idea included Florence Cane, Margaret Naumburg, and Viktor Lowenfeld, who developed what he termed “art education therapy” in which students with disabilities were given opportunities to personally express their frustrations and define themselves through their art (Rubin, 2005).
One of the most interesting themes that this inquiry has generated is the number of early accounts that consider the relationship between art education and art therapy. By early, in this context I refer to before 1950, and as the American Art Therapy Association did not come to be until 1969, some of the literature of this time period reflects this struggle for identity and positionality that art therapy was facing. Three examples stand out from my examination as being especially consequential: early work done by Viktor Lowenfeld, Freidl Dicker-Brandeis, who worked in a concentration camp during World War II, and Victor D'Amico, a pioneer in art education and director of the Museum of Modern Art's education department for over 30 years. Each of these early theorists considered ways that art education and art therapy can work together, and each proved to be highly influential, as they were prominent figures who are still cited for their contributions today.

Viktor Lowenfeld developed his own type of hybrid of art education and art therapy which he termed “art education therapy” (Michael, 1981). In the third edition of *Creative and Mental Growth* (1957), Lowenfeld included an entire chapter devoted to a discussion of his topic, “Therapeutic Aspects of Art Education”. This chapter contained information on Lowenfeld's studies with the creative process and people with disabilities, provided a theoretical base for art education therapy, and considered the implications associated with different disabilities by type. The chapter also included some of Lowenfeld's case studies, but was removed from all later editions and has proven to be very difficult to find. Thus, according to Andrus (1995), Lowenfeld began to bridge art therapy and art education in the 1940s, and his work is still considered to be some of the
most influential, justifying his status as an art education leader. There are certainly critics of his work as well, who dispute this title and claim that Lowenfeld focused so much on creativity and experimentation, that he steered the core purpose of art education away from other fundamental aspects, such as technical skills and art history. Lowenfeld certainly was more interested in a psychological approach to art-making, and this encouraged some art teachers to adapt a similar approach, thus “over-psychologizing” (D'Amico, 1943) the experience from a different perspective.

The story of Freidl Dicker-Brandeis is fascinating, and it is curious to consider what might have happened had it not ended so quickly. According to Wix (2009), Dicker-Brandeis was a Bauhaus-trained art educator, who was interred in Terezin Concentration Camp in 1942 in an area north of what is now Prague. She taught art lessons to children who had also been placed there, and considered ways that art could help them psychologically survive the war (World War II). Dicker-Brandeis' philosophy on teaching art in this context emphasized courage, truthfulness, imagination, empowerment, and confidence, and she encouraged her students to draw without thinking, with the expression of their work outweighing the importance of their technical abilities. Wix (2009) stated that Dicker-Brandeis “makes a distinct contribution to art therapy of artistic empathy as a basis for postmodern philosophy and practice” (pg. 152). Dicker-Brandeis was one of Edith Kramer's professors, who would go on to make significant contributions to art therapy herself. Through the efforts of Freidl Dicker-Brandeis, over 5000 student works that were created in Terezin were saved. Dicker-Brandeis and her students, however, were not; she was murdered in Auschwitz in 1944 with 30 of them by her side.
Dicker-Brandeis, although trained in art education, saw a need to modify her practice to better teach to these traumatized students, which she did by incorporating elements of what is now defined as art therapy, and in doing so, created a meaningful connection between the two.

One article that I found particularly interesting is “Art Therapy in Education”, written by art education pioneer and longtime director of education at the Museum of Modern Art Victor D'Amico (1943). Although D'Amico can be seen as belonging more to the field of art education, for which he was a renowned and respected national spokesperson, his ideas are strikingly similar to some of the basic principles of art therapy. D'Amico thought that creative work was a way for anyone, regardless of ability, to discover and correct mental, emotional, and physical disturbances they may be experiencing. He believed that free expression was crucial, and that art-making needed to provide autonomy in choice, conception, and execution. D'Amico (1943) stated “the simple experience of creative expression has a healing effect” (pg. 9), and prescribed that the United States employ art in a plan for re-education following World War II in order to avoid the development of mental and emotional handicaps. D'Amico suggested that art teacher and psychologist work together, and noted a growing interest in the therapeutic value of art on the part of art teachers.

The boundaries between art therapy and art education have been blurred in many instances, and it can be difficult to differentiate between them as they are often intertwined. Pergjini (1999) described the visual arts as a “therapeutic process” and discussed the possibility of using it to help young students to deal with parent separation,
sibling rivalry, jealousy, fear, anxiety, and other issues that they may be facing, but does not implicitly imply that this is art therapy. She noted experience, expression, and communication as key aspects in this process and stated that “art can...work toward the healing of our deepest fears and concerns” (pg. 3), all included in a guide for general classroom teachers. This guide also described how providing art opportunities can help students with aggression, as they can be uninhibited in art and free to express themselves as they wish and free from any set morality; it can be one place for them in which delinquent and cruel imagery can be accepted. Nissimov-Nahum (2008) also provided a model for utilizing art with children who behave aggressively, and also suggested that free expression be central to an effective approach. Nissimov-Nahum does directly name this type of practice art therapy, which he sees as particularly useful for aggressive students in that they are often abundant sources of creative energy, whose aggression can be improved when a teacher conveys acceptance and directs students toward appropriate change.

The value of free creative expression is echoed in much of the literature this inquiry has generated (McMurray, 1998, Clemens-Hines, 2008, Wix, 2009, D'Amico, 1943, Jarboe, 2002, Hale, 1998, Buchalter, 2009, Rubin, 1999, & Malchiodi, 2003), and is considered valuable whether in terms of art education or of art therapy. Clemens-Hines (2008) described some of the benefits that appropriate, free self-expression can derive for students with special needs, and described the art room as a venue to teach planning and emphasize the process. McMurray (1998) suggested that free expression be internally driven, psychodynamically oriented, and spontaneous, and that the art therapy process be
tempered by the patients capacities and the therapists guidance. This is one of many examples in which the same principles can effectively apply directly to art education if the terminology is shifted wherein art therapy becomes art education, the patients become the students, and the therapists become the art educators. McMurray's suggestion would then be that the *art education* process be tempered by the *students* capacities and the *art educators* guidance, which makes perfect sense and explains the most basic function of how art education functions. A same sort of substitution can also be applied to an example included where the core of art therapy is triangulated into patient-therapist-creative process, as the core of art education is student-teacher-creative process. This method of substitution has been effective to me in considering to what degree and in what context these terms can logically take each other's place, and also in pointing out that there are many situations when there are clear separations between art therapy and art education, and elements that are specific to one or the other.

Goldblatt (2006) noted another example of a blurry boundary between art education and art therapy in her exploration of the ways in which John Dewey's theories relate to art and art education. Although this article makes no direct reference to art therapy, the practices that it describes are again very similar. The basic ideas expressed in this article that stem from Dewey consider art as experience, this experience as potentially transformative, and art acting as a catalyst for anyone who participates in creating it to address realms that lie beyond the physical. Goldblatt also emphasizes Dewey's belief in art's versatility for multiple intelligences learning, and as a tool to express global experience, thereby eliminating bias. Dewey (in Goldblatt, 2006) saw art
as a means to democracy, and stated, “learning to see and think in school can shape the future. If art reflects liberty of expression, than those who pursue it through art are involved in a sociopolitical action to reconstruct a world of improved and advanced social relations,” (pg. 22). This idea that art has the ability to affect anyone partaking in it and its unique ability to effectively reach anyone, regardless of ability or intelligence, through art therapy or in art education, is an over-arching theme that has recurred throughout this inquiry, along with a belief in art's ability to transform.

Some of the literature I have addressed in this study has chosen not to consider the possibilities that might be generated in drawing connections between art education and art therapy, for whatever reason, but I have also discovered several accounts in which this idea is explored directly. Dalke (1984) described the relationship between art therapy and special education in relating it to a poem, in which Frost questions why neighbors might put up fences if there are no cows within which to confine; what is being walled out and what is being kept in. Dalke noted that the positive ramifications that could develop in merging art therapy and special education are unlimited, and I would like to further apply this philosophy to art education. With inclusion, in which all students are included in all educational experiences as much as possible regardless of ability, the art teacher is often expected to function in the same way as a special education teacher would to teach to students with varying disabilities. In the case of a special education teacher, students with special needs that cannot be included in particular classes instead separate from their peers and go to such a specialist for more individualized help where more time can be devoted to each student, and the teacher has extensive training in
strategies and techniques to teach students with disabilities. Dalke describes the rich and effective curriculum that could develop from combining art education and special education, as the special education aspect could explain what skills need to be improved while art provides strategies for how this improvement might happen, resulting in benefits for students such as better attitude, self-concept, self-awareness, perception, motor and academic skills, self-identification and identification with experiences; generally increasing students success in school and preparation for life after.

Connections between art education and art therapy were discussed by Thompson (2009), who described studios that promote the centrality of the art process through experimentation with materials and promoting self-awareness. Although these studios do not claim to be and may not necessarily be conducting art therapy on purpose, they reflect a clear overlap between the two. Thompson (2009) made an interesting comparison, explaining that these facilities “employ studio art and educational practices rather than art therapy, yet clearly the fields overlap, as the tenacious, irascible attribute of the art product constantly reappears in art therapy theory and practice much like an uncanny return of the repressed” (pg. 160). Thompson explained this in terms of being reflective of the greater debate between process and product; art therapy seeks to emphasize process but is steeped in a need for a product to act as the object of evocation. The same philosophical debate is a central issue in art education, and Thompson's suggestion for addressing this in art therapy can also be used to consider this debate in art education, “Attending with care to the artistic process within art therapy helps to ensure an optimal therapeutic experience that can be extended to both the product and its potential
reception” (pg. 164). Thus, the process is seen as a necessary and vital component of a successful experience. Lam and Kember (2004) support an emphasis on process, as process is conceived part from which one gains personal meaning and emotional fulfillment.

Jarboe (2002) provided one example of how art therapy might be used in a school setting, but through the use of an art therapist instead of integrated with art education. This situation offers many benefits to students as well, however, when considered from a practical perspective, which considers that the reality of the situation today is that many public schools lack funding to support a general art program, being able to provide an art therapist seems completely unrealistic. Riley (1996) noted that art therapists struggle to maintain their existence in health care and in education alike. Nonetheless, in an ideal world, and in some select school systems, this is the case, and the ability of an art therapist to incorporate art therapy certainly greatly outweighs those of an art educator with limited to no formal training in art therapy. In this approach, students are treated individually, and art therapy is reserved for students with diagnosed disabilities to improve specific aspects of their learning, behavior, physical and/or emotional health that are determined before art therapy begins. Jarboe (2002) discusses tools for assessment that art therapists might incorporate, including the six stages of psychosocial development as laid out by Viktor Lowenfeld, and the Rawley-Silver Draw A Story Test. Jarboe also explains how variations in drawing style or developmental level may have significant implications for that student, including missing body parts (often an expression of denial), strange proportions, and odd spatial relationships. Pifalo (n.d.)
noted how art can often reveal deeper issues that might not surface otherwise, such as sexual abuse or trauma, as art bypasses verbal communication. As people are generally more inclined to express things verbally, there are better established defenses for verbal expression, but the same cannot be said for visual expression as in creating art.

Gantt (2009) discussed the Formal Elements Art Therapy Scale (FEATS), which seeks to evaluate students by examining various elements of artwork, and considering what these variations may imply. This is a specific qualitative evaluation that considers fourteen different formal elements which are used collectively to provide insight into what may be expressed in the students' work. This evaluation scale focuses on structure instead of content, examining elements such as mood, depicted by the prominence of color, decreased or increased energy reflected in space and detail, illogical thinking expressed in problem solving, color fit, and integration, and cognitive deficits that may surface graphically as rotation, perservation, line quality, and realism. While this scale represents a somewhat complicated evaluation technique, and one that certainly requires training to be used effectively, with a general understanding of the concept, it also would provide art educators with an increased sensibility to these components, and may again offer increased insight into the work students create.

Although Jarboe (2002) advocates for schools to include a trained art therapist in their faculty, she also hints at the possibility that an art educator might be able to similarly interpret student's art, “a perceptive individual with an art background and knowledge of clinical principles is able to interpret the subliminal messages children express in their work,” (pg. 3). Although art educators may lack the capacity to diagnose
or provide therapy for students whose art might express questionable variations, an awareness that this might be happening could act to provide greater insight for teachers, and thus encourage them to be more sensitive to the meaning of what a student's art might be. This would allow teachers to consider their student work as not merely a superficial creation, but perhaps a small window into who that student is and what experiences they might have had.

Essex (1996) also considered the role of an art therapist in a public school setting in providing services to underserved or at-risk students, and noted that there is little available in literature that addresses this role, or how to integrate an art therapist or an expressive therapist into a mainstream school art program. Essex also noted that art therapy in these cases be used primarily for students with disabilities, particularly physical disabilities, and that the art therapist be used to facilitate a student's ability to implement change. While Essex suggested that art therapy be conducted specifically by and art therapist and separately from regular classes, this approach was also considered in terms of negative impacts it might generate for involved students. These include increased anxiety from the feeling of being different, needing help, and having to provide an explanation to classmates who might question what the student is doing and why they need art therapy. Essex encouraged art therapists to assume the role of a collaborator, and a part of a treatment team that works together to effectively address issues that students are having. This can be accomplished when the team adopts a set of shared goals, which “further a child's cognitive, emotional, social, and creative development through a unique integration of experience. Educational goals include improved communication and
interpersonal skills, increased awareness through self-expression, and increased self-esteem through mastery” (pg. 186). These components are often some of the same results that might come out of an effective art education curriculum, and an effective art educator might also work as part of a team, collaborating with general classroom teachers and school psychologists to best understand the needs and to achieve the best results for their individual students. This demonstrates how an art teacher could be a vital component of an effective individualized education plan, or IEP. An IEP is a plan created for any student with a disability by the teacher and school psychologist, and includes information on the specifics of the particular disability, while outlining goals and strategies to help the student successfully achieve them. I believe that an art educator would be incredibly valuable here, and as they often teach a student for more than one year, they would add an element of continuity that the classroom teacher, who changes every year, could not provide.

Natale (1996) described one example of a school that effectively employed an art therapist in Fairfax, Virginia, but it is a school that specifically caters to sixth and seventh graders with emotional disabilities. In this instance, the art therapist is the art teacher, and art therapy is offered as an elective course for students. At the Herndon Center the central idea behind the program is that success is not based on mastery of a particular skill, but on whether or not students are able to trust enough in themselves and the people around them to push past their fears and take chances. The art room at this school contained fountains with rocks and frogs, parakeets flying freely around the room, a Zen garden, and tables cleaned everyday with rosewood oil to generate a calming effect. Mr.
Torrezano, the art therapist at this school, participated in creating response art, in which he worked alongside students to create his own work that was reflective of what was happening in his classroom. Creating response art is a common practice for some art therapists, who create themselves to gain better insight and understanding of the issues that surface in clinical therapy. It is interesting to consider how a similar practice might be adopted for art educators. Art educators are, after all, submerged in art, and creating response art might help art educators to better relate to their students while reconsidering their role in that student's life.

Fish (2008) also discussed response art, and defined it as art that is created by an art therapist to contain, explore, and express clinical work. Response art can be used to achieve a number of different results, including demonstrating understanding and adding clarity to the experience. Verbal communication can be invaluably supplemented with response art, and it can generate a deeper awareness of issues that may arise. Response art depends on active listening and empathy on the part of the artist to create this authentic and visible response reflection. It can be seen as another tool in the proverbial toolbox that can be used in working with patients. Although art educators may not have experience creating this specific type of art, art-making in which a teacher considers and expresses what takes place in their classrooms may certainly act in many of the same ways to provide many of the same results, and may help teachers to relate to and better understand the experiences of their students. The strategies for setting up the physical classroom environment Natale (1996) discussed, including fountains, frogs, parakeets, and rosewood oil address multiple intelligences and certainly add interest to the
classroom. While they may require some moderation to prevent them from being
distracting, any art educator could integrate them into an art classroom without
specialized training, and they demonstrate ways in which the physical environment can
be made more accommodating.

Hale (1998) also considered the importance of the art therapy environment,
suggesting that teachers seek to provide students with a safe zone free of judgement that
nurthes trust and love. More specific suggestions Hale provided include remembering
the importance of all individuals, being fair to everyone, understanding when children are
struggling with personal difficulties, and even laughing. These suggestions are also
applicable to the art education classroom, and are basic philosophies that one would hope
would be present in any classroom setting.

Amorino (2009) discussed ways in which art therapy might be used to reawaken
artistic expression. Amorino described a recent atrophication of artistic development in
students, and offered explanations for why this often irreversible 'condition' can occur,
such as students perceptions of “good art” as an unattainable goal, the narrow definition
and cognitive emphasis of art instilled by the U.S. school system, and a lack in
recognition of art creation as a means for representing and communicating personal
concerns. This atrophication is seen as generally occurring at an adolescent level, and as
requiring authenticity in artistic learning and personal experience, and a deeper
understanding of the artistic process, which art therapy can provide, and which can be
reawakened through sensory based teaching. Amorino (2009) largely holds the field of
art education as responsible for this lack of engagement, and stated, “the field has been
woefully neglectful in providing its teachers with grounded and cogent understanding about the psycho-intellectual complex which underpins the artistic process” (pg. 216). He also described teacher preparation for art educators as nebulous and disparate, due to art education's failure to identify the psycho-social origins of its own practice.

Other authors cited needs for improvements in teacher education, such as Parashak (1997), who noted that many art educators are working with special needs students, with little to no training in media or activity adaptations that would allow them to engage special needs students effectively. Parashak suggests that a combination of art therapy and art education would provide unique strengths, as they would together create a sort of hybrid specialist, who is trained in strategies for intervention and also has a mastery of art processes. Parashak is a professor at Southern Illinois University, where she has developed a unique class, “Art Education in the Elementary Schools” that is designed specifically to bring art therapy concepts to the art education classroom. This course is particularly effective in preparing teachers to work with students with special needs, and relates information that helps teachers make informed decisions that reflect a knowledge of specific disabilities such as learning disabilities, emotional and behavioral problems, visual and hearing impairments, and physical disabilities, suggesting a multisensory approach that appeals to and accommodates a wide variety of learners.

Bush (1997) described how she helped to facilitate the integration of art therapy into the public school system in Dade County, Florida. Art therapy was first introduced to this district in 1979, when it was experimentally offered under the aegis of art education as a possible strategy to help to ameliorate behavioral issues. In this pilot program,
registered art therapists who also had their art education certification were employed in order to work with selected students with disabilities in a self-contained classroom and also to provide staff development. The purpose of this project was to help severely disabled students, as the teachers were not adequately trained to deal with these disabilities effectively. Specific objectives included training art teachers to understand the essentials of child development and art, to provide background information on disabled students and the nature of their disabilities, and to demonstrate the potential of an art therapy approach in engaging special needs students. Bush (1997) stated that, “the shared philosophy of art education and art therapy remains as a viable and effective modality for serving youngsters with special needs,” (pg. 11).

In this article, Bush (1997) also notes an absence of documentation and research on school art therapy, and theorized that this is in part attributed to a lack of national guidelines, thereby a lack of clarity on how to proceed. Bush considers obstacles that might inhibit the growth and development of school art therapy, such as a need for graduate level preparation or certification that is specific to school art therapy. Biases among administration, parents, and educators about the use of therapeutic methods in school settings would have to be overcome, as many people do think of school as a place to teach, and that psychotherapy has its place elsewhere. Money and funding is a consistent issue for any art program, and it is no different in the case of school art therapy. According to Bush (1997), “art therapy and public school education are a successful partnership. Together they can provide the tools with which to lead students to self-expression, and thus into emotional and cognitive growth,” (pg. 14).
Andrus (1995) provided reasons to theorize how connections between art education and art therapy have been purposefully de-emphasized in recent years. She explains this as a result of practices of each discipline; art therapy has a developing interest in defining and developing its own professional identity and is therefore moving away from associations with art education. At the same time that this identity crisis has steered art therapy away from art education, art education has moved from a psychological emphasis to discipline-based art education, which instead emphasizes art production, art history, criticism, and aesthetics. Since this article was written, art education has shifted its focus again, incorporating visual culture and emphasizing interdisciplinary connections between subjects to situate itself as a part of an integrated curriculum. Regardless, Andrus indicated that art therapy is strongly rooted in art education, and that over the years this relationship has been noted by many art therapists regardless of the current focus of the curriculum. She worked as the director of a clinical art therapy program in the art education department of Buffalo State College in New York, and has spent much of her career modifying her role and identity in art education while continuing to work as a clinical art therapist. Andrus (1995) stated, “Reading the pertinent literature in both art education and art therapy has enriched my perceptions and understandings of each discipline's unique perspective. In turn, my classroom teaching is more amplified and more broadly informed” (pg. 232).

If art therapy can only help art educators to generally develop their classroom teaching to be “more amplified and more broadly informed”, than it has added something of value to pedagogy. This section has demonstrated many of the ways that art education
and art therapy makes connections to one another, and I have given special consideration
to any strategies or examples wherein elements of art therapy have been used
successfully in art education both specifically and generally. The examination from this
perspective that this inquiry has generated is extremely multifaceted, but I think that this
allows these connections to be considered from a number of different perspectives and
philosophies. The degree to which art therapy can be and has been successfully integrated
into art education can only be assessed spectrally, and is completely dependent on the
ideologies and motivations of the individual involved. This chapter, in beginning with a
historical inquiry into how each discipline has developed, and moving through
interactions and different ways that people have combined the two, has generated a
number of possibilities for how these connections can be and have been made. It has also
considered the nature and potential developments for these interactions within a greater
context.

In the next chapter, I bring my own experiences into this context that I have
created. I continue to reflect on how these ideas affect my own pedagogy and how I see
my role as an art educator. I also emphasize a few key points from this discovery of the
how art education and art therapy have developed and interacted with each other through
the years, and consider ways that my practice is supported in this context.
Chapter 4: Reflections and Implications for Practice

In this chapter, I focus all of this aforementioned material on how it can and has impacted my practice as an educator. I consider several over-arching ideas that have been widely supported, and, I think, are largely undeniable aspects of art therapy that make their way into art education. I say this because I believe that the two ideas are inextricably intertwined, and rooted in many of the same philosophies. I began this inquiry thinking that it would provide specific strategies or ways of thinking from art therapy that would lend themselves to art education. But, having gone through my literature review and in having critically reflected on what it has generated, that idea has been replaced. Instead, I have come to see very clearly that this inquiry would not stand on terra firma this way, but instead by selecting a few general points that are necessary parts of art education and related to art therapy: teaching to students with special needs, product versus process, and free expression, and discussing instead how art therapy can lend itself in these applications. In doing so, I create an argument for art therapy's place in art education that is less disputable; I would hope that any teacher would consider these aspects of pedagogy and the ways that I think art therapy can be used to inform them does not necessarily require any specialized training or major changes in the teacher's approach, but rather a reconsideration of what art therapy can be and what it can
mean for practice. I consider this in terms of how my research and inquiry into art therapy has already impacted my practice and what I include in my concept of my role as an art educator. My experiences teaching art classes to preschoolers with hearing impairments certainly could not have occurred at a more relevant time in my professional life. I really believe that it is one instance of an experience that was simply meant to be, and it has really helped me to see directly how these new thoughts about art therapy and new knowledge about art education and art therapy both carry over to my practice.

I have been teaching four classes of students at a school I will refer to as North Elementary; two classes each of three to four and four to five year olds since March of this year (2011). I came about the opportunity by chance, through an email that I got from Ohio State University's department of art education list-serve. The email was written by a parent who was appealing to the school to try to secure a volunteer art teacher to work with students with hearing impairments as a drop in funding had resulted in preschool having to go on without an art program, and I quickly made plans to meet with the preschool teachers and principal to begin implementing art lessons.

TEACHING STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

This experience has been unique for me in that I have been thrown into it without any training in teaching to students with hearing impairments, which leads me to the first point that I would like to consider; preparedness to teach to students with disabilities. I can say that in my own personal experience, having attended Ohio University for my undergraduate and The Ohio State University for my graduate school, I have been sadly disappointed to discover a tremendous lack from either to provide me with an opportunity
to learn ways to approach teaching students with special needs. This is a huge problem in my mind, for several reasons. First, in my experience during student teaching, and at North Elementary in teaching art lessons to preschoolers with hearing impairments, I have been faced with educating many students of varying disabilities. I have not felt like I am adequately prepared to teach them, let alone in a manner that provides them with best practice. Instead, I have scrambled to think of ways to adapt materials and techniques, which has been a learning experience down a fairly bumpy road. And, with the funding issues that many schools continue to face, inclusion of students with special needs is and will certainly continue to be common practice. I can't imagine a situation in which any teacher would have a class wherein every student is functioning at the exact same ability level, thus teaching to students with varying (dis)abilities is a necessary part of being an art educator.

Following my experience at Ohio University, where I was enrolled in one special needs class in the College of Education, and deemed appropriately educated to graduate and begin teaching, I enrolled at The Ohio State University. I was fairly confident that my graduate studies here, in 'the top program for art education', would fill in the gaps for me and leave me feeling that I had a better understanding of teaching art to students with disabilities. But, as I am now in my final quarter, that is simply not the case. I have taken every opportunity I have found in the colleges of art education, general education, and disability studies, to take any class that is even remotely related to teaching to students with disabilities. I have found several instances in this inquiry wherein this lack of preparedness has been directly noted, such as Parashak (1997) who described art
educators as having little or no training in activity or media adaptations to work with special needs effectively. Bush (1996) also discussed how part of the reason she was able to develop an art therapy program within public schools in Florida was because many of the art educators there were not prepared nor were they able to handle teaching to their special needs students, and stated “the shared philosophy of art education and art therapy remains a viable and effective modality for serving youngsters with special needs” (pg. 11).

None of the classes I have found have even touched on art therapy, unless due to me bringing it up, and none of them have spent any significant amount of time educating me on what it means to teach art to students with disabilities. I do not feel any more prepared now than I did then from material that these courses provided me, but, through this inquiry, I have begun to find what I am looking for. Art therapy has not given me a prescriptive strategy for the best ways to teach to each disability, or how to best approach a given situation. Art therapy has, however, provided me with some general ways of reconsidering my practice objectively, and has given me a renewed perspective on my role as an educator teaching art.

I see this lack of preparedness as being particularly problematic given that I am relating it to teaching art; one of few subjects in school that anyone can be successful in. I think that the art room should be one of freedom and exploration; a place for students to express themselves and not be structured by having to do things a certain way to achieve a certain result. It is here that I bring into play the endless discussion between product and process. This is a source of ongoing debate, and the question of which is more
important will never have one answer. I tend to agree with work similar to that of Lam and Kember (2004) who valued process for its ability to generate personal meaning and emotional fulfillment. I can say that from my experience, emphasizing product has never made sense, and I have had to work through my own preconceptions of what qualifies as a success, to reconsider it.

PROCESS VERSUS PRODUCT

In designing my lesson plans, I imagine my students engaging with my ideas and going above and beyond my expectations to create visually attractive products easily and effortlessly, and with limited guidance on my behalf. However, in executing my lesson plans, I have found that this preconception is completely unrealistic, impossible, and unnecessary. I am reminded of Cole's (1940) statement, “The teacher should remember that the growing process is more important than the end product- the child more important than the picture” (pg. 23). I have re-evaluated my role as an art teacher, and begun to consider my students work instead in terms of what they learned, whether or not they engaged with the lesson, and what they expressed in their work. It has been a challenge to let go of the product, and to focus on the process, and to feel that I have been successful as an art teacher in what I have given my students in these terms instead of how cute their projects turned out to be. I see now that focusing on product was a selfish goal for me to have as an educator; I had not done it on purpose, but I had focused my efforts on helping them to create superficial and aesthetically pleasing works like mine, instead of using art as a way for them to develop, express themselves, and be free to be creative and do whatever they want with my projects. I have begun to see a departure
from my planned project not as a bad thing, but instead as an incredible opportunity for a student to grow and to be creative, and this has now become a new way for me to judge myself and whether or not I feel that I am teaching successfully. I have moved from considering whether students were able to follow my directions, to instead consider what they took from my directions and how they used them as a starting point. I have begun to restructure my lessons and my vocabulary to give my students more choice and freedom to express themselves in the projects that I introduce to them, and the results that have come from it have been very impressive. Not only are the results (products) more interesting and diverse, but my students are more engaged with my projects, and I feel that they are beginning to understand that art provides choices, and is a place where being different and creative is a good thing, not something they will be reprimanded for. Consequently, in shifting my emphasis from product to process, the product has actually been greatly improved, both aesthetically and in what the artwork means to the student.

This idea of valuing process over product is not embraced by all, and I am thinking of one teacher in particular that I work with at North Elementary, who I will call Mrs. M.. From day one of my experiences as a volunteer art teacher at North Elementary, this teacher has rubbed me the wrong way. My first day of class, I had designed a lesson in which students would trace cardboard numbers, then cut them out, glue them to a piece of paper, and make them into flowers by adding stems, leaves, etcetera. I had planned this lesson thinking that it would be simple enough, and it would introduce students to basic techniques of tracing, cutting, and gluing, while tying it all back to numbers, which they were learning about in their regular classrooms in an attempt at incorporating an
integrated curriculum in which my projects relate directly to what they are learning in other subjects. I remember thinking that some of them probably would not turn out perfectly, but just hoping that they would be able to at least cut and glue something, recognizable number or flower or not. When I introduced the idea, Mrs. M laughed and said “Ok, well, you'll be surprised because my kids can't even hold a pencil”. Mrs. M's class combined with another class of the same age for my art sessions, and this other teacher did not express similar thoughts. This statement was shocking to me; not only did she decide what her students could do, but she automatically dismissed the project because of that decision. As I watched her class struggle to wait for her to help them with every little part, I watched the other part of my class struggle with a project that was perhaps a little too involved.

That was a hard day for me, and it left me feeling very discouraged and wiped away my confidence. But, like I always try to do, I let it go and started again. I went home, cried, and reconsidered whether or not I was cut out to be an art teacher (which is a scary thought after 6 years of training). Then I reflected on why I was upset and what I needed to do differently. I was not upset because of what my students had done, but because they were not able to do what I thought they should, and because this teacher had made me feel like I should have known that to begin with, and that my idea was useless. In reality, my idea might have been asking a lot from these students, but it was an effective lesson in that it gave me a better sense of their ability levels, and still gave them an opportunity to learn new techniques and to practice their new skills, which is a success in and of itself.
In my next project, I had pre-cut circles for the students to glue onto paper with glue sticks to make caterpillars, and crayons for them to add details and complete the backgrounds however they wanted to do it. In this project, Mrs. M would not allow her students to use glue sticks, and instead helped each of her students one-by-one, as the others watched (obviously bored out of their minds) waiting for their turn. I really wanted to step in here, to give them each a glue stick and some crayons and to let these kids go. It was painful for me to watch them be so excited when I described what we would be doing, and then have to sit and watch or be reprimanded for doing anything but. These are three and four years olds, and Mrs. M completely dictated what they were able to take from the lesson, instead of allowing them to discover these materials and techniques on their own. Not only that, but in having so much control over them, she took the fun out, and many of the students were obviously disengaged. This was a striking comparison to my other table of students in the same class doing the same project but with a different teacher. These students were smiling, talking, and having fun. I remember thinking to myself that I should focus instead on that part of the class, as they were not encumbered by their teacher's projections, but allowed and encouraged to engage in the projects as I had intended for them to.

This pattern of doing their work for them has continued in each project that I have introduced. In my last project, for example, I introduced tearing paper as a way to illustrate. Mrs. M promptly explained to me that her students cannot tear paper (!) and again proceeded to dominate their work, and basically do it for them, resulting in eight nearly identical pieces that closely mirrored the example I had given. I overheard her
saying to herself, “At least they look like something.” This, once again, was astonishing to me. I could very clearly see that Mrs. M and I have completely opposite philosophies on our roles as teachers. I taught preschool for a year myself; this age group is fairly familiar to me, and I cannot think of one time that I would have thought that I was doing a good job as a teacher to do their work for them, no matter what they were able to do on their own. Is that not the essence of our profession; to teach? I have been impressed in my experience at what my students are able to do if they are given proper guidance. I have found ways to teach complicated methods and techniques, such as folding paper cranes to students as young as seven; certainly these preschoolers are able to use a glue stick and tear paper if they are allowed to learn how.

This position is uncomfortable to me in this way, and I have often considered whether or not it is my place to intervene. As much as I would love to talk candidly with Mrs. M and to explain my thoughts, I have not felt that I am really in a position to do so. I see these students once a week, for thirty minutes at a time, on a volunteer basis. I feel that having a conversation with her about these issues would make her even less inclined to help her students engage, and it is simply not possible for me to teach them on my own, as many of them are non-verbal and require a lot of assistance. Instead, I have tried to bring in projects that are more open-ended, that do not emphasize getting certain results, but just allow students to explore materials. I still find it unsettling to think about this class of students, and how their preschool experience might be different if they had a different teacher. I hope that there are some strengths that are also inherent with this approach, although I cannot really think of what these might be.
In order to best approach this without causing any problems or creating any controversy, I have tried to find ways of splitting up projects so that the students work with me on at least part of it, and I can let them go and be free to explore, and encourage exploration instead of directing it so closely. For example, I just finished a project that I have done many times before with young students in which they color on coffee filters with markers, spray them with water so that the colors move and bleed together, and then use a pipe cleaner to turn the filters into butterflies. For this project, Mrs. M stayed at the table to help her students color. When I say 'help', I mean that she gave them each 1 or maybe 2 markers that she chose for them, told them 'color', and got very upset when they forgot to put a cap back on their markers when they finished. I remember her also getting upset when she could not find a student's coffee filter, which I had to remind her that she had refused to give the student, because the student was not paying attention when it was finally time for her to get her coffee filter (this was a deaf student, bear in mind, and this teacher was upset when she wasn't listening). When students finished the coloring, they were permitted to come to me, and I let them spray their own filter. Mrs. M had told me that they would not be able to, actually I believe her words were “Ha! Good luck!” , but there were actually only one or two of all sixty seven students that could not use a spray bottle.

I have to say that Mrs. M was unique in this way; all of the other teachers that I worked with did allow their students to have freedom in what they did. It became obvious to me as time went on that the other teachers were not close to Mrs. M as they were to each other, and often ignored her when she would talk to them. I kind of felt sympathetic
for her for a minute; working with this group of students is not an easy task and perhaps she was just frustrated. Any hint of sympathy quickly vanished when I over heard her say to a fellow teacher “Can I just put them in a room and let them kill each other? Please?” This was not a comment said in confidence, but in the middle of our art class with a student perched on her lap. This was one instance in which the other teachers chose to ignore her, and I followed suit.

These other teachers seemed to get it; they would help their students if they really needed it, but there seemed to be an understanding that these students were just doing their best, and these other teachers did not seem to care if their projects were perfect. They complimented their students on their work, and were elated at the results, regardless of what they were. I think the comment that I overheard the most was that teachers were impressed by how engaged students were with the projects, and by how much they enjoyed coming to art and being creative. In this context, I know that engagement is happening when I look around the room and see my students focused and interested by what they are doing, whether or not they are precisely following the directions. Some of my best moments in this experience were when students surprised me with what they did, in their creativity and in their abilities, which often far surpassed anything that I had imagined. Nothing makes me happier than seeing my students engaged, learning, and excited about what they have done, and I am happy to say that I think most teachers would feel the same way. Fortunately, I think that the majority of teachers understand this idea, and do not follow the same pedagogical philosophy as Mrs. M, although there are certainly many who do.
This idea of considering process over product really rang true for me when I considered what my four and five year olds were doing in my art classes. One surprising thing that came out of this exploration for me was that when I emphasized process and let the students have more freedom, the products were actually incredible!!! I purposefully focused my directions for my older preschoolers on use of materials, and noticed that the most common phrase that I used in this explanation was, “But you can do whatever you want. If you want to make such-and-such or so-and-so, that's fine. It is up to you to decide how you want to approach this, and if you have any questions just let me know.” I was so happy to hear my teachers saying to my students “Whatever you want!” and to see their genuine excitement when students produced amazing and unpredictable results. It seemed that these teachers began to get just as excited about art as the students, and their attitudes in my classes were always very positive and encouraging. I think that it is because I did not emphasize product that the students were able to bring themselves into their artwork, and in doing so created some very meaningful, expressive, and creative works that were far more incredible, individual, and expressive than if they were each able to follow my directions step-by-step and create the same thing that I had in mind.

When I develop and think about my lesson plans now, I try to think of ways to open them up, instead of ways that I can manipulate them to have more control over what students create.

FREE EXPRESSION

This brings me to another part of my discussion; free expression. From Lowenfeld, Naumburg, and Cane, who studied creativity and the role of free expression
in developing it before art therapy was even defined, to more recent literature from theorists such as Rubin and Malchiodi, free expression is seen as perhaps one of the most useful and widely applied aspects of art therapy. Free expression is a simple idea: facilitate the process and provide the materials, but let the artist determine what is created and how. Anyone can do it and there are no necessary limitations that must be put in place in order for free expression to be carried out. D'Amico (1943) was an art education pioneer, who thought that free expression was a mirror of inner life and personality. According to McMurray (2004), free expression is the cornerstone of art therapy; it is vital to allow for spontaneous and internally driven free expression to have any success as an art therapist and it is what art therapy is based in.

As an art educator, I have begun to reconsider my projects in terms of free expression, and made an attempt to allow free expression to at least be a part of every lesson that I teach. I have found, however, that as an art educator and not an art therapist, free expression for me is not completely free. If I simply provide materials and let my students go without direction, they do not necessarily create anything, let alone something that expresses their inner life and personality, perhaps in part due to their young age and inexperience with art-making. I think that there are notable differences between art education and art therapy in terms of free expression, and they are largely due to the differences in goals that the two disciplines have. While self-actualization and appropriate self-expression are a part of art education, we also have to include other components that shift how free expression can come into play. I see art education as having many of the same goals of art therapy, like self-actualization and self-expression,
but being wrapped up and packaged together with its own objectives, such as technique and material usage. Thus I have begun to see and to design my lessons in this way; teaching technique and material usage and then allowing for free expression to determine how and to what ends these techniques and materials are used.

One point that this inquiry brought up that I have seen in my experience is how free expression can be invaluable in working with students who are particularly aggressive. Pergjini (1999) explained that free expression allows aggressive students to express cruel or delinquent imagery, as art is not tied to any set morality, and may be the only place they are allowed to carry on uninhibited. Nissimov-Nahum (2008) explained that free expression is ideal for aggressive students as it promotes ego development and provides an outlet for their creative energy. In my experiences at North Elementary, I have been working with one student in particular, who I will call Johnny, who can be extremely aggressive. Working with Johnny has been challenging at times, as it can be difficult to divert his aggression at times and it can overtake him if he gets too upset. I have spent entire class periods working with the other students in his class while his teacher remained devoted to holding him and trying not to get hurt from his kicking feet and swinging fists. Johnny knows that if he gets louder and more upset, he can usually get what he wants, and this is often his behavior.

I have paid particular attention to Johnny and been very interested in his behavior when he was in my class. I remember one of my first experiences working with him; he had taken his shoe off and thrown it at a classmate, so his teacher took it from him and put it up on a shelf behind him. He sat across the table from me, and started quietly
yelling and motioning toward his shoe. I ignored this behavior at first, and tried to get him back to working on his project. But, Johnny got louder and louder, and closer and closer, until he was literally hitting me on the arm and screaming in my face. I didn't know what to do- his teacher was still trying to ignore his behavior and carry on as if nothing was happening, but I could not, and there was no way that I could get Johnny to sit down and even begin to care about his art project. His teacher eventually had to take him out of the room so that he could calm down again, but he was completely disengaged at this point.

After that experience, I really began to watch Johnny very closely, as I really wanted to figure out what set him off and how I could get him to focus on his artwork. I began to see that the more I directed him, the less engaged he was. As I tried to help him to work through something, he would become distracted, and lose interest. This was not the typical response that I was used to; instead of my one-on-one helping him to understand and focus it was actually doing quite the opposite. I found that Johnny was most engaged when I didn't say a word, and just let him work.

I remember catching myself in our last project, in which I introduced watercolor. Johnny's class was much smaller than my other classes, and they were able to finish a project before the other classes were, so I decided to let them paint freely with watercolors while the other classes caught up. I have what one might call a 'pet peeve' about colors getting mixed together, closely related to a possible smidgen of obsessive compulsive disorder, which also results in a dislike when my food mixes on my plate. I don't mind when it is done on purpose, or by accident in an exploration of color mixing,
but it really bothers me when every color of paint becomes the same muddy brown because students forget to rinse their brush between colors. I am careful to emphasize this step to my students, not because of my personal sentiments but just because I try to conserve and preserve my materials. On this particular day as I painted alongside my students, I was pleasantly surprised to see that Johnny seemed to really be engaged, and even smiling as he painted. I looked at his paint and watched him dip his brush in the water, then run it forcefully through every successive color on his palette before putting it to his paper. There were puddles of brown water all over the place, and I had to wipe his neighbor's papers of spatters of brown paint several times. Just as I started to clean up his mess, and to re-direct him, I stopped myself to ask why. I considered the bigger picture, and thought about Johnny's behavior. I quickly changed my mind and decided that the appropriate free expression that Johnny was so excitedly partaking in was far more important than having a clean table. I decided that it was more valuable for Johnny to have a chance to make a mess and to do what he felt like than to precisely follow my directions. I asked him to please be considerate of his neighbors, but let him go on happily making brown. This lesson, in which I had no pre-determined product in mind, proved to be the only time that I saw Johnny really care about his work, and noticeably deriving satisfaction from it.

I think that in proceeding in this way allows me to function as both art therapist, to a very limited degree, and art educator, and to be successful in fulfilling the intentions of both, without stepping outside of my role as art educator or having to learn a tremendous amount about art therapy, or to function as a therapist. This is exactly what I
hope this whole inquiry will be able to do; to provide ways of incorporating art therapy while staying true to one's identity as an art educator. Furthermore, to demonstrate how art therapy is already a part of art education, to reconsider what this part means from a renewed perspective, and to develop new ways of seeing our roles as art educators; not as just people who teach students how to draw, but to understand how our teachings impact our students on a deeper level.

Thus, in this chapter I have reflected on how inquiry has led me to change my approach to practice in my role as art educator teaching preschoolers with hearing impairments and other disabilities at North Elementary. I have considered the ways in which art therapy has enacted a change in my pedagogy in terms of embracing free expression and trying to tie it in consistently with all of my projects. I have discussed one way that free expression has directly impacted my practice in working with a particularly aggressive student, and I have emphasized a number of ways that I have experienced positive implications resulting from a switch for me from focusing on product to focusing instead on process. This chapter has acted to tie some of the loose ends of my inquiry together, and to demonstrate how this new knowledge of art therapy has already impacted my teaching in a positive way, without requiring formal training or the abandonment of the perspective on art education that I have spent the last six years creating.

In the next chapter, I consider the big picture that this inquiry has developed. I examine several other issues that this inquiry has brought up and revisit some of the earlier points that I discussed in the introduction to consider how this inquiry has shifted my initial ideas. The next chapter includes a hypothetical examination of some of the
considerations that would have to be made in order to for art therapy to be used by art
education, and I support this idea by emphasizing the philosophies of several prominent
art educators and art therapists who suggest that such a connection is in fact possible, and
that it would in fact enhance art educations ability to provide every learner with an
engaging and meaningful art experience. I also consider how the historical section of this
inquiry has given me a new perspective from which to understand art education and art
therapy; how they have come to be and why they remain largely separated from one
another today.
Chapter 5: Discussion

This chapter revisits previous chapters to consider how my ideas and philosophies have been impacted and changed from this inquiry into the relationship between art therapy and art education. I begin with my introduction, and reconsider how my sub-questions may or may not have been answered, and the ways that proceeding through this inquiry has changed the questions that I think are most relevant to this exploration. I also reflect on thoughts and new ideas that the historical sections of my literature review generated for me, and take a step back, moving from a micro to a macro perspective to consider the big picture that has begun to develop, discussing some of the trends that have emerged from this body of research. This chapter includes a consideration of what would need to happen in order for art education to begin to integrate some of these most basic elements of art therapy, such as being better prepared to teach to students with disabilities, including free expression, and understanding the impact of valuing process over product as I have discussed in the previous chapter.

I think that one of the most interesting surprises to come from this investigation was that it provided me with a new lens to consider the essence of art education, a profession that I have now invested six years in studying, which I had not known that I would need to find, nor did I expect to develop from my research. When I think about
how my view of art education has changed, I am reminded of one of my favorite quotes by Marcel Proust, “The real voyage of discovery consists not in seeing new landscapes, but in having new eyes.” During my six years of formal training in art education, I regretfully admit that I never really critically considered what it is I am doing in a most essential way in my role as art educator, and I also never really considered how art education has come to be, and why I should critically consider the methodologies and pedagogical strategies my professors have taught me. Instead, I have often blindly accepted what my professors have presented; I have not really experienced anything as of yet that has pushed me to question their authority. I try to consider everything that I am exposed to somewhat objectively, but I think that in terms of art education, my criticality has been replaced by a need to soak up everything that I can. A lack of experience and a desire to embrace anything that might improve my practice has led me to unknowingly lend an almost absolute authority to the institutions that I have attended, and to trust that they are providing me with what I need in order to be most effective in my professional role.

After engaging in a historical inquiry of art education, a number of points have stood out to me and have been points of further reflection. First, I was somewhat surprised to learn that art education was not included as a necessary part of public school until the Industrial Revolution. And, when it was widely introduced during this period, it was done so in order to create a new working class of people to fill the factories who had an understanding of mechanical drawing and would have a greater skill set that would make them more useful as employees. Art was not included or appreciated for its ability
to communicate inner thoughts and feelings, or to boost student achievement, or teach to varying ability levels, but as a way to make more money.

Another interesting idea that the historical part of this inquiry led me to consider is that there is not nor has there ever been one standard, universal way to teach art. Art education has shifted over time in approach and motivation, depending on the social climate at the time. It has concentrated on pictorial reproductions and representation, as in the Picture Study movement. It has been used very practically, as I referred to in relating art education to the Industrial Revolution. Following World War II, when many European immigrants brought their perspectives on art education and art therapy, art education went through another revolution, and began to embrace the psychoanalytic theory being adopted to art by theorists such as Viktor Lowenfeld and Margaret Naumburg, leading to a more progressive approach to art education that focused on creativity and child development. In more recent years, art education has again been exposed to and integrated another new philosophy, discipline based art education, which seeks to include art history, art criticism, and aesthetics as well as to teach technique and material usage.

As such, my understanding of what art education is and how to best practice it has lost it's footing for me, and has moved from solid ground to a slippery slope, where a lack in identity leads me to feel insecure in its future. This feeling of insecurity is perhaps in part due to the fact that art education is an ever-changing complex of interactions and does not have a precise form.

One positive note that I can include in this consideration of art education is that I see this insecurity as also providing an opportunity for change and growth, as I would
like to see in allowing art therapy to be included as well. I think that if art education was
more clearly defined, it would not be as apt to consider how art therapy might lend itself
to improving art education. I also think that as art education is extremely vulnerable, and
is cut out of the curriculum of an increasing number of public schools each year, it might
be even more willing to consider art therapy, as it could strengthen art education in terms
of what it is able to accomplish for learners of every ability level. I hope that when art
education considers it's future; how it might be able to keep it's head above water and
maintain it's validity as a necessary subject, art education would see that art therapy
might be just the push that it needs.

I have been excited to come across a number of art educators and art therapists
both who have directly supported connecting art education and art therapy, and have
discussed what this connection might be able to do from their perspectives. It has been
curious to consider how, in earlier years, before art therapy was established as something
completely separate from and outside of art education, this connection was made quite
frequently. And, although art therapy and art education were often directly connected in
practice, as in many classrooms that endorsed a creative or self-expressive rhetoric, this
connection was not necessarily made explicit, nor perhaps was it even known to be. This
is another case in which art education and art therapy have some of the same
characteristics; they belong to both instead of one or the other. Many of the most
influential figures in art education's development were strongly connected to
psychoanalytic theory, much of which remains the basis for art therapy still today. These
figures include Franz Cizek, Viktor Lowenfeld, Margaret Naumburg, Florence Cane, and
Edith Kramer. Following the creation of the American Art Therapy Association, art therapy has seemingly moved away from art education and worked to establish its place and define itself outside of the realm of art education.

However, there have been several recent instances in which arguments have been made for combining art education and art therapy, and I have found a number of different ways that others have approached this idea. Jarboe (1996) spoke specifically about how variations in drawing style, such as odd proportions or body parts being left can be indicative of internal conflicts, and can be recognized by art educators, “A perceptive individual with an art background and knowledge of clinical principles is able to interpret the subliminal messages children express in their work” (pg. 4). Jarboe is not suggesting that an art educator attempt to diagnose a child as a therapist might, but that they should be able to at least recognize that this may be occurring, and consider the fact that student work might contain meaning that is more profound than superficial.

Thompson (2009) described several art studios that promote the centrality of art, including experimentation with materials and using art to promote self-awareness. Although these studios operate without making any claims to art therapy, Thompson noted a clear overlap between the two fields, and that the two are inherently related, and cannot avoid making connections. Parashak (1997) echoed an overlap that is, “apparent in art therapy and art education approaches,” (pg. 241), and remarked at the number of art therapists who have art education as their professional roots, Parashak, an art therapist, designed and taught a class at Southern Illinois University, in which she lectured on how
art therapy can lend itself to art education in terms of working with students with special needs, which she believes art education does not prepare art educators for adequately.

Andrus (1995) also noted a lack of preparation for art educators to teach students with special needs, and described ideological and philosophical connections between art education art therapy. These included providing services for students with special needs, teaching art educators to teach students with special needs, and developing a sensitivity in teaching to students with unclassified special needs (such as those are depressed, or who may have experienced abuse, or have been exposed to drug addiction). Anderson (in Andrus, 1995) predicted that art therapy would become a required component of art educator teacher training, and recognized that an art therapist would be an ideal person to come into an art education program to help teachers better understand how to approach teaching their students with special needs.

Dalke (1984) described some of the derivatives that could come from incorporating art and special education, and considered the unique combination of expertise that would result, providing students with a dynamic and effective education plan that is able to understand what skills to improve and is able to provide strategies for how to improve through art-making. Dalke emphasized the many benefits that this type of a combination would create, and created a model for how this interaction could take place, beginning with a conference to determine student needs, deciding on a delivery system to meet these needs, and then facilitating art activities in order to meet these pre-determined goals. This model included an evaluation program that emphasized ongoing, informal testing. The model that Dalke provided here is strikingly similar in procedure to
what happens when an IEP, or individualized education plan, is created for a student with a disability. Although art educators are rarely a part of the IEP team, Dalke demonstrates how an art teacher could work with a special educator to create just such a plan. Another point of support to this idea that Dalke did not provide but that I find to be very valid is that the art teacher often follows the student for more than one year. In an elementary school, for example, the same art teacher usually teaches students as they move through the grade levels and through different teachers; the art teacher remains a point of consistency and therefore has a unique perspective on the student and the progress that they may be making.

An outstanding trend that I have noticed in this exploration is that, in many instances, perceptive art educators have engaged in art therapy without any training in it or knowing that their practice could be seen as belonging to it. The most interesting example that stood out for me was described by Wix (2009) in an account of German art educator Friedl Dicker-Brandeis, who was interred during World War II into a concentration camp called Terezin. Dicker-Brandeis recognized that the students she was teaching art to needed to be able to express themselves and to freely create art as a means of helping them to cope with the reality that they faced; watching others around them die, being removed from their families, and wondering if they might be the next to go. In a similar situation was Marie Paneth, who worked with children creating art during World War II in an abandoned bomb shelter, and, later, a condemned house (Hogan, 2001). Paneth also recognized that, by allowing this group of children to have access to materials, and by allowing the freedom to experiment with the materials to create self-
directed work, she was able to provide liberating and empowering experiences in which they could find an outlet for their feelings and healthy ways of expressing themselves. This brings me back to Passion Works, and my description at the beginning of this study, when I explained how art therapy as I know it was happening; in my time as an employee there I watched many of the artists with disabilities develop and grow and become more expressive, more verbal, have sometimes incredible improvements in physical ability. Many of these people had spent their lives living a certain way, and through art-making they were able to redefine who they were and what they could do. Patty Mitchell, the director and founder of Passion Works, is not an art therapist, but a formally trained art educator. Although Passion Works does not claim to be developed in art therapy, that is exactly what happens there, and with incredible results from what I have seen.

And that supposition leads me to wonder further where the line exists that separates art therapy and art education? Furthermore, who has drawn this line? It is as if art education and art therapy are siblings, who without question share art as a parent, but have grown up and gone their own ways. Regarding my own practice and my role in teaching art to students with hearing impairments, I am left to consider; am I too incorporating art therapy? Sub question after sub question can follow this exploration, and I hope to be able to revisit this body of research and pursue it further in the future. These additional questions include: where can I take these ideas? How might art therapy be limited in what it is able to contribute to art education? In what specific terms could a connection be directly and explicitly made? Could a balance be achieved between art education and art therapy that could provide every student with the best possible and
most beneficial learning experience? How could this be evaluated or assessed? This question is particularly difficult to answer, as 'best possible learning experience' is a completely subjective construction, and is really impossible to define.

This is the beginning of a rhizomatic series of questions dealing with the multifaceted and complex nature of the connections between art education and art therapy. This chapter has considered several of the more obvious and over-arching points of departure that have been generated in this inquiry. I feel that the idea of creating a stronger and more direct tie of art therapy to art education has the potential to help art education secure it's place in public education, and could greatly improve an art educator's ability to teach students with special needs. This chapter has emphasized instances in which these opinions have resonated in other contexts. I have also returned to my beginnings, and gone back to rethink my conceptions of my experiences and of what I expected this paper to accomplish.

In the concluding chapter of this study, I summarize each section to briefly describe what they have accomplished and how they have helped to create a cohesive body of research. I emphasize the major points that this inquiry has brought up, and discuss how they have begun to inform my practice, ideologies, and philosophies regarding my role as an art educator. I also draw attention to specific strategies that can be inferred from this exploration of art therapy to provide suggestions for art education, and consider how these strategies can directly impact pedagogy.
Chapter 6: Conclusion and Results

In this concluding chapter of my study on the connections between art education and art therapy, I consider how each of the previous chapters have helped to create a working and readable body of research that examines this issue from the ground up. I briefly move through each chapter, and seek to emphasize any noticeable trends that are grounded in this inquiry. This conclusion also includes my experience, and demonstrates how this experience has resulted directly in a shift in my attitude as an art educator, and in what I hope that my lessons will accomplish. I consider the significance of this study to the field of art education, emphasize specific strategies that have been generated in this inquiry, and hypothesize on ways that this study could be continued.

Beginning in my introduction, I have positioned myself within this body of research in talking about my own experiences that led me to this discussion. I explained how, while working at Passion Works, an art studio for adults with disabilities, I first witnessed and began to develop an interest in art therapy. Although Passion Works was not set up with the explicit function of art therapy in mind, it seemed to be going on regardless. This was the first time that I had experienced what it could be like to work with people with varying levels of disabilities in an art context, and I was impressed by how engaging in art-making allowed many of the resident artists there to improve their
skills and ability levels like nothing else had. By simply providing access to materials and letting them create freely, many of the individuals I worked with at Passion Works became increasingly verbal and were able to express themselves, to a degree that had not even been recognized as possible for them before they began making art.

From my experiences at Passion Works, I have continued to be interested in creating art with people with disabilities, and have really wanted to learn more about working them, and about art therapy. Although my enrollment at The Ohio State University has provided me with an opportunity to learn and be part of one of the top art education programs in the country, I did not feel like it gave me any opportunity to pursue my interest in art therapy, nor did I feel that it allowed me to adequately prepare myself to teach students with disabilities, even though I have taken every class that I have found that in any way relates. These were my interests going into the program, and as such I have discussed them in the context of many different classes over the past two years. I remember one instance in particular when I brought up the idea that art therapy might be able to be used in art education, if perhaps only in limited applications. I felt like I had been attacked when the discussion was taken over by my classmates, who quickly judged this possibility and decided that they were not art therapists, and could not be expected to function as such. That experience has stuck with me, and I have been very careful to emphasize that I do not believe that art educators should be therapists for their students. I think that if my classmates were to learn more about what art therapy is, and to acquire a basic understanding of some of the philosophies that art therapy is rooted in, they would see that art therapy can and already does in some way apply to their practice.
Some of these most basic assumptions to which I am referring include teaching to students with disabilities, providing opportunities for free expression wherein students are not limited and can decide for themselves what they create, and also the implications for students when teachers value and emphasize the process involved instead of the product that is created.

The literature review chapter of this study was the most comprehensive because this study was largely based in a critical review of what had been written regarding art therapy and art education. This chapter demonstrated how art education and art therapy were connected and often grouped together, emphasizing inherent characteristics that facilitated this connection and provided a space for this to exist. In this way, my literature review has provided political clarity, as it has followed art therapy and art education as they have shifted over time following the cultural climate, and have grown apart from each other as each have tried to develop their own identity. This idea that art education and art therapy are and can be connected is certainly not a novel idea, and I was able to discover many accounts in which other people were considering some of the same ideas.

My data collection process, moving from reduction to reflection, taking it apart and analyzing it, and then putting it all back together, has proven to be successful in generating a distilled series of strategies and recommendations that answer my question of how art therapy can inform art education in specific terms. I began with a large volume of information, and have funneled it through increasingly narrow focus, moving from a historical context that examines art therapy and art education from their roots, and filters
out any interactions and intersections that were generated in this exploration. I reflected extensively on my own practice, and synthesized it with pieces of information that I have drawn out of this study.

Specific strategies that were generated in this study come from a number of different sources and were found in a variety of different contexts and applications. Regardless, these strategies provide basic, general recommendations that I believe any capable art educator can and should take into consideration in their own practice. Natale (1996) discussed the importance of the physical environment of the classroom and emphasized that consideration be given in terms of how the classroom can be made more accommodating to a variety of ability levels. Natale used an example of one art therapist/art educator who cleans the tables with rose oil to provide a calming affect and allows birds to freely fly about the room during class, giving much consideration to how students function within the environment that has been created for them. Hale (1998) also considers the classroom, and recommends that art educators emphasize that it is a place of equality and fairness, in which everyone is safe to express themselves freely.

Nissimov-Nahum (2008) suggests that the art educator has a unique ability to convey acceptance of a students self-expression, and that this acceptance allows the student to be more receptive to change if they are not met with rejection as they may be in other subjects. This conveyed acceptance is a cornerstone of art therapy and is a necessity in order for growth to occur.

Essex (1996) also refers to the unique positionality of the art educator in terms of what they might be able to provide to a team collaborating to provide suggestions for
students with disabilities. What Essex suggested is remarkably similar in practice to how an individualized education plan or IEP is created, and emphasizes ways in which an art educator and special education teacher could successfully provide pedagogical strategies to help improve the student's learning experience. Including an art educator as a part of this team can be supported also by the fact that many art teachers teach the same group of students year after year as they progress their education; they are consistent while their general classroom teachers change every year and thus have a unique perspective on each student's progress and abilities.

I think that this idea can be taken a step further to consider how an art educator who has some background knowledge in development and psychology as could be garnered from art therapy would have even greater insight into understanding their students with disabilities, and could thus act to help create an even more effective IEP than an art educator with no knowledge of art therapy whatsoever. Parashak (1997) discussed how combining art therapy and art education would effectively create a sort of hybrid specialist who has a greater capacity for understanding and providing best practice to students with a variety of learning styles and ability levels.

Natale (1996) considered response art, a strategy in art therapy in which the therapist creates their own piece of art as a way of gaining insight into their therapeutic experiences with their patients. I think that this is another strategy that could apply to art education, and would allow art educators to gain new perspectives on their practice and experiences in the classroom.
This study was especially poignant regarding my present role as a volunteer art teacher at a school for students with hearing impairments. In this position, I am designing and implementing lessons of my choice for preschool age students, and have faced some significant challenges along the way. These challenges have been in part due to what I believe is inadequate preparation on the part of my professional training to prepare me to teach students with disabilities. As I attended two major state schools and specifically studied art education at both, it seems as though my experience and ability to teach to students with special needs has been at least typical if not exemplary, especially given the status of the art education program I am currently completing at The Ohio State University. However, this experience has proven to me that I still have a lot to learn, and I have been surprised in writing this paper to discover many overlaps between my research and my practice.

These overlaps primarily reside within the three aforementioned connections that I see between art education and therapy; teaching to students with special needs, free expression, and valuing process over product. I have noted ways that these three points have directly impacted my practice at North Elementary in specific scenarios, described at length in the discussion chapter of this inquiry. Generally speaking, adding free expression to every lesson and encouraging students to be creative and apply their own ideas to my lessons has been extremely beneficial; it has resulted in increased student engagement that is obviously expressed by the time and care they give to their work. It is like providing a coloring book instead of a sketchbook- they may not be interested in the pictures that have been already made for them, but if they are allowed to decide what the
pictures are themselves, drawing in their own creativity and experiences, their work becomes meaningful and relevant to them. Closely related to allowing students to be autonomous in their art choices is the idea of valuing process over product. Every child has their own unique set of abilities, and to expect that they will all be able to successfully create a pre-determined piece of art with pre-determined characteristics is unrealistic. Teachers that have this thought in mind may become frustrated, as I have observed in one teacher that I work with at North Elementary who more or less does her student's projects for them, instead of allowing them to explore the materials and techniques and learn from the process of creating. Both of these ideas relate back to the ability of an art educator to teach to students with special needs; here free expression and valuing process over product are ideas that have come directly from art therapy to apply directly to my practice in teaching art to students with disabilities, thereby improving my abilities as an art educator.

This study and the idea that art therapy can in fact successfully inform art education could be very significant to the field of art education. I hope to continue to develop this research over my career as an art educator, and I hope to find ways of learning more about art therapy and relating it back to my practice. I think that art therapy is very comfortable with working with students with disabilities, and art education is not. Art education is certainly interested in improving itself in this respect; I saw a number of presentations at the NAEA (National Art Education Association) conference in Seattle this year that addressed specific disabilities or provided strategies on modifying materials or techniques for students with disabilities. But from my experience and in conducting
this inquiry, I think that art education as a whole does not adequately address or attend to this issue. Having a basic understanding of some of the principles of art therapy that I have discussed and what they can mean for participants would allow art educators to see their practice in a different way, and to better understand the nature of development and creativity, thereby providing additional strategies for teachers and allowing them to successfully and optimally teach to a wide variety of learners. At a time when many schools are eliminating art from the curriculum, adding meaning, potential, and ability to art education as art therapy may be able to do could prove to be invaluable in helping to secure art education's position within public schools, and our jobs as art educators.
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